

[Kissinger](#)

# KISSINGER

## THE SECRET SIDE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

a book by [Gary Allen](#)

Copyright 1976 [[sourced](#)] [[Amazon](#)] [[pdf version](#)]

---

### [Chapter One](#)

#### [GULLIVER ON THE BEACH](#)

### [Chapter Two](#)

#### [THE MAN BEHIND THE MYTH](#)

### [Chapter Three](#)

#### [KISSINGER AND THE SHADOW GOVERNMENT](#)

### [Chapter Four](#)

#### [DESTRUCTION THROUGH DETENTE](#)

### [Chapter Five](#)

#### [THE RED CHINA GAMBIT](#)

### [Chapter Six](#)

#### [THE UNQUIET PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST](#)

### [Chapter Seven](#)

#### [BETRAYING FREEDOM IN LATIN AMERICA](#)

### [Chapter Eight](#)

#### [THE SELLOUT OF SOUTHEAST ASIA](#)

### [Chapter Nine](#)

#### [THE RISING RED TIDE IN AFRICA](#)

### [Chapter Ten](#)

#### [WATERGATE AND THE CIA](#)

### [Chapter Eleven](#)

#### [MOSCOW'S MAN IN WASHINGTON?](#)

### [Epilogue:](#)

#### [THE IMPACT OF KISSINGER](#)

## Chapter One

### EXCERPTS:

While the FBI reported that there were at least 15,000 terrorists operating in the U.S., many openly encouraged, if not supplied and directed, by foreign powers, the United States was dismantling or handcuffing every major governmental unit charged with investigating such assaults on our security."

**This book is the account of one man who, we believe, may be another wolf, entrusted with the job of protecting the sheep.** It is the story of the person who, more than any other individual inside the U.S. government, has been the chief architect and apologist for the policies whose effects we have summarized above. It is the record of the present Secretary of State, **Henry A. Kissinger.**"

As we penetrate the cloak of falsehood and deception that has been erected to protect the man and myth, we will find that **Dr. Kissinger has deliberately misled the Congress and the American people on numerous occasions.**

## GULLIVER ON THE BEACH

The United States entered its Bicentennial Year with great hoopla and fanfare. But not even the star-spangled splendors served up by television, nor the less palatable pap pouring forth from politicians, could hide the stark reality: The United States is failing as leader of the Free World. It is being outflanked, outgunned, and out-maneuvered by the world communist movement.

A nation which had an unquestioned eight-hundred percent strategic military superiority over the soviet Union in 1960 was settling, sixteen years later, for second-place status. A country which led Europe and Japan to post-war recovery was itself being ravaged by inflation, recession, and unemployment.

A people who had never before lost a war watched helplessly as thousands of lives and billions of dollars were dumped into a conflict halfway around the world, while our own leaders said victory was not our goal. After 50,000 American lives had been lost, a sham "peace" was arranged -- and within three months three former allies were clutched in Communist hands.

As Red insurgency broke out in Thailand, burma and Malaysia, the Philippines decided to mend fences with communist china, North Korea again threatened to invade the South, and Singapore, Malaysia, Japan, and even Australia wondered aloud just how far they could count on the American presence in the Pacific.

The United States had already "opened the door" to mainland china, whose leaders are unquestionably the bloodiest mass murderers in human history. Red China practiced a smiling and beguiling diplomacy toward the West, while serving as the world's major pusher of drugs.

In europe, a crumbling North Atlantic Treaty Organization was racked by dissension and outgunned by the Warsaw Pact military alliance. Marxists seized power in Portugal, the new regime in Greece was intermittently hostile to the United States, communist Party strength in France and Italy was at an all-time high, and the Mediterranean was thoroughly dominated by the Russian fleet.

In the Middle East, a "peace" treaty had sown the seeds for a much greater war to come, the Suez Canal was opened to Communist vessels but denied to ships of the U.S. Navy, and russian "advisers" were moving into Africa by the tens of thousands. Each sharp soviet thrust was met by a listless, ineffectual response from the United States.

While Red china was reporting its eighteenth nuclear test, the Soviet nuclear-powered submarines began operating from cuba, Russian vessels played cat-and-mouse with an anemic American fleet in the Pacific, and the massive soviet fishing fleet came very near to driving the U.s. fishing industry out of business.

In our own hemisphere, *detente*-numbed negotiators were simultaneously maneuvering to lift the U.S. quarantine of communist cuba, and, in outright defiance of Congress, were plotting to give away the Panama Canal.

As the communist world grew more powerful and more brazen, it was official United States policy to facilitate the wholesale gift of American advanced technology and sophisticated equipment to the Red bloc. While the United States experienced double-digit inflation, its government secretly negotiated to

give millions of dollars worth of foodstuffs to the Communists on credit. And while the energy crisis grew worse, our weird policies had the dual effect of limiting U.S. production of oil while increasing the price of foreign imports.

At home, Congress and the communications media were questioning not the demonstrably growing Communist subversion and terror in this country, but the perils posed by our own security agencies.

While the FBI reported that there were at least 15,000 terrorists operating in the U.S., many openly encouraged, if not supplied and directed, by foreign powers, the United States was dismantling or handcuffing every major governmental unit charged with investigating such assaults on our security.

The American taxpayers continued to pay the lion's share of all expenses for the United Nations, which is dominated by a gaggle of Marxist dictatorships and "third world" totalitarians. The American host was abused by this parasitic combine virtually every day, often by member "governments" that practiced a bestiality and savagery usually associated with Stone Age tribes. And, when the United States finally appointed an Ambassador who would (verbally at least) give as good as he got, he received so little support and so much criticism from our own State Department that he quit in disgust.

To any objective observer, it must have appeared that American leaders had followed Alice in her trip through the looking glass. Or perhaps a collective madness had struck New York and Washington simultaneously. How else can we explain such an amazing tangle of setbacks and surprises, mistakes and miscalculations, disastrous blunders and humiliating defeats?

Was this catastrophic foreign policy what most Americans expected when, in 1968 and 1972, they gave a thumping majority to a man who was hailed as "the conservative, businessman's President"?

Certainly not.

Do a majority of Americans favor recognizing Red Cuba? Do they really concur in our abandoning the Panama Canal? Are they for one-sided wheat deals and technological giveaways to the Soviets? Do they agree that the Soviet Lend-Lease debt to the U.S. should be cancelled, that billions of dollars in other loans should be forgotten? That the United States accept a lesser role in world affairs -- become a second-rate power, no longer capable of defending its allies or its own freedom? Of course not!

The obvious truth is that a majority of American, armed with the above information, would oppose these policy decisions. This political fact of life was reflected in the campaign rhetoric of 1976, as the Administration pushed such unpleasant subjects as the Panama giveaway and the consequences of *detente* to a back burner.

As children we read in *Gulliver's Travels* of how the normal-sized Gulliver, washed ashore on an island run by diminutive Lilliputians, was captured and tied down by his tiny hosts. Gulliver possessed more than enough strength to smash all of Lilliput -- at first. And yet, he found himself completely at the mercy of the Lilliputians. He had been bound down, while he slept, by thousands of tiny threads. Each single strand could have been broken, but the cumulative effect of all of them put Gulliver totally under the power of his enemies.

The United States today is in much the same, if you will pardon the pun, bind. This giant of the world, possessor of the greatest productive capacity in the history of man, with its awesome defensive and offensive power, is being immobilized by a seemingly endless array of isolated acts. But the net effect of *all* of the pacts, agreements, treaties, and accords is to paralyze American strength just as surely as Gulliver was held down by his physically inferior captors.

Undergirding this book is the conviction that what has happened to the United States, and what

continues to happen -- this incredible lopsided weakening of the United States, while we pursue policies that support and strengthen our enemies -- is not the result of mere happenstance.

We believe that much of what is happening in the world today can be explained by one single, terrible word: conspiracy. The basic outline of the plot, the historical background and present purposes of the most important protagonists, have been discussed by the author in two previous works (*None Dare Call It Conspiracy* and *The Rockefeller File*) It is not our purpose to replot all of that ground again here.

Yes, we believe it is possible for moral, intellectually honest men to believe in globalism, the evolution of a world government, the need to reduce tensions, to "build bridges of understanding", and similar slogans. We also believe that the great majority of persons promoting such policies are sincere and well-meaning. We can accept the explanation that they truly believe what they are doing will benefit all of humanity.

But. . . this does not mean that they are right. Or even that everyone in their corner really is sincere. Alger Hiss managed to convince every Liberal who knew him that he was just another sympathetic sheep in the fold. His friends forgot that there are real wolves in the world.

This book is the account of one man who, we believe, may be another wolf, entrusted with the job of protecting the sheep. It is the story of the person who, more than any other individual inside the U.S. government, has been the chief architect and apologist for the policies whose effects we have summarized above. It is the record of the present Secretary of State, Henry A. Kissinger.

As we examine each part of the record, we will find that the indictment is a terrible one. This will not be an Horatio Alger account of the rise of a poor immigrant boy to power and fame; it is not a self-serving piece of puffery that has been sanitized of all unpleasant facts. This will be a cold, hard look at the record.

Quite simply, we believe that Dr. Kissinger's continued occupation of a powerful position in our government presents a clear and present danger to this Republic. As we penetrate the cloak of falsehood and deception that has been erected to protect the man and myth, we will find that Dr. Kissinger has deliberately misled the Congress and the American people on numerous occasions.

Perhaps, as at least one defector from the Communist intelligence network has charged, it is possible that Kissinger's policies have been so favorable to the Communist bloc because he works for them!

Is Henry A. Kissinger a conscious, willful agent of a conspiratorial apparatus working for a New World Order? Or is he rather a vain, brilliant, twisted intellectual? Maybe he is both of these.

One thing is certain: Dr. Kissinger has owed far more allegiance to the globe-girdling interests of the House of Rockefeller than to his ostensible superiors in the White House, or even to the American people he purports to serve. (And the best interests of Americans, and America, are by no means synonymous with the Grand Design of the House of Rockefeller!)

The issue today is not whom he serves (although that question is crucial), but what he has done. That is the subject, and the only subject, of this study. We have no access to secret documents, classified information, or the like. Everything in this book is taken from the public record. In the pages that follow, there is little that is new. but there is much that is shocking.

We hope this indictment makes you angry. We hope it makes you think. And then, we hope it makes you act. For we believe that the future of this land of liberty may well depend on whether -- and how soon -- our present disastrous course can be changed.

## Chapter Two

### EXCERPTS:

Who, after all, *is* Henry Kissinger? He is not, to begin with, Henry Kissinger. He was born **Heinz Alfred Kissinger** on May 27, 1923, in Fuerth, Germany, **the son of** Louis Kissinger, a school teacher and **rabbi**, and the former **Paula Stern**. Like many Jewish families feeling the rising impact of Naziism, the Kissinger family fled Germany to the United States in 1938."

[Questions: Was his mother, Paula Stern, related in any way to the famed terrorist "Stern Gang" in Israel? How did the family manage to escape the alleged 'gas chambers' in 1938? Five years earlier, In August, 1933, in his ABC broadcast declaring a Holy War against Germany, [Samuel Untermyer](#) exclaimed that: "We must save the 600,000 Jews in Germany", That is not a typo. The number of Jews in Germany at that time, according to Untermyer was 600,000, not 6,000,000, and they had begun leaving nearly as soon as Hitler took office. - JP - transcriber}

As presidential adviser, and later as Secretary of State for the outgoing President, Henry Kissinger had: Handled the Intermittent Middle East war so ably that. . . **Kissinger had represented both the Soviets *and* the United States in the negotiations there.**"

Henry the K was nothing less than an outright Rockefeller agent ready to carry the family's "Grand Design" into the White House. "

He was the man who said "power is the ultimate aphrodisiac", and who was quoted in New York Times magazine as joking, "The illegal we do immediately. the unconstitutional takes a little longer".

(It was during this period as intelligence-gatherer and interrogator, one defecting communist double-agent has claimed, that **Kissinger himself was recruited by the KGB** and given the code name Bor. More on this in Chapter Eleven.)"

At the 1971 shake-up, Nixon created a special committee to which the CIA director, the Attorney General, the Under-Secretary of State, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff would henceforth report. Chairman of the strategic committee was -- surprise! -- Henry the K.

He controlled every piece of intelligence to reach the President from the State Department, the Defense, Department, and the Central Intelligence Agency.

## THE MAN BEHIND THE MYTH

When President Nixon finally told the man he had appointed as Vice President of his decision to resign, the first thing Gerald Ford did was telephone Secretary of State Henry Kissinger.

It was August 1974, and all the king's horses and all the king's men couldn't put Richard Nixon together again. Watergate had already cut deeply, toppling presidential advisers, counselors, election campaign chiefs, an attorney general -- and now a President.

The only member of the inner circle apparently untouched by it all was the pudgy, beak-nosed Secretary of State, a man whose less-than-spectacular visage had already graced the covers of more magazines than any other presidential adviser in history. The king of flight-bag diplomats, who was continually jetting off to "resolve" another world crisis, had come to be known variously as "Henry the K", "Superman", Super Kraut", and other, even more flowery, descriptions.

This physically undistinguished diplomat with the deeply guttural German accent, who had so often been seen in public with gorgeous starlets and well-connected socialites, was reputed to be a secret -- and very successful -- swinger.

This was the man -- and the myth -- to whom the appointed vice President turned *first* after it was apparent that Richard Nixon, enmeshed in a web of tapes and cover-ups, was being forced from office by a scandal whose origins had been murky and whose political outcome was devastating.

We are told it was Ford who requested a meeting with Kissinger -- a meeting which lasted two hours. The soft-spoken Midwesterner prevailed on the whiz-kid super-diplomat to stay on. It was about as tough a sale as peddling a snow cone to a thirsty Arab. *Time* says Ford simply told Henry, "I need you". *Jawohl*, replied Henry. Later, in his first public utterance as President-successor, Ford announced that all was well with the Republic because Kissinger had consented to remain on the job.

The whole scenario seemed strangely out of place for a reportedly conservative, Midwestern Republican. After all, Vice President Ford and President Nixon had both been presented to their party -- and to the nation -- as a "conservative, pro-business" candidates and office holders. Yet in 1968 Nixon's first major appointment was to place Henry Kissinger in the key post of Adviser for National Security Affairs.

But, as presidential adviser, and later as Secretary of State for the outgoing President, Henry Kissinger had:

- Been the primary architect of the "opening" to Communist china, while working secretly behind the scenes to oust the Republic of China {Taiwan} from the United Nations, which Free China had helped found.
- Emerged as spokesman for appeasement of and "rapprochement" with the Soviet Union, and promoted policies which guaranteed the Soviet Union a strategic military superiority over the U.S.
- Arranged for supplying the latest American technology and know-how to the Soviet block, while waiving \$11 billion owed the United States by the Soviet government.
- Provided the U.S.S.R. with American wheat on incredibly favorable credit terms, while bread prices skyrocketed at home.
- Designed the Vietnam "peace" accords with the North Vietnamese Communists (for which he shared a Nobel "Peace" Prize), agreements which guaranteed the Communists victory in Vietnam in the *first* war ever lost by this country.
- Handled the Intermittent Middle East war so ably that, according to his friend, Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin, Kissinger had represented both the Soviets and the United States in the negotiations there.
- Alienated such long-time American allies as Turkey and Greece, thus weakening NATO and allowing the Soviet Union to dominate the entire Mediterranean.

- Urged a policy of "reconciliation" with Communist Cuba, a Soviet satellite successfully planted in the Western Hemisphere which subsequently sent "volunteers" to stage a Communist coup in Angola.
- Attempted, despite massive Congressional and public opposition, to surrender American sovereignty over the Panama Canal, and endorsed the claims of a Moscow-lining Panamanian dictator to the vital waterway.
- Supported a boycott of anti-Communist Rhodesia as a "threat to world peace" with the result that the U.S. became dependent on the Soviet Union for chrome ore.

As national security adviser, Kissinger had created an information-gathering, policy-deciding empire far vaster than anything assembled by his predecessors. He was given so much authority by Nixon that he became the second most powerful man in the White House -- if not the most powerful. (His "boss" did not survive Watergate; Henry did.)

He was the man who said "power is the ultimate aphrodisiac", and who was quoted in New York Times magazine as joking, "The illegal we do immediately. the unconstitutional takes a little longer".

This is the man who eavesdropped on his own staff and bugged suspect newsmen, but who, when challenged about it, blackmailed both Congress and the media by threatening to resign if they did not ignore his role in the telephone taps.

Yet, this was the man whom *Time* called "the world's indispensable man" and whom *Newsweek* caricatured as a flying superman.

Like the rest of his image, Henry's reputation as an over-sexed Lothario who sweeps the girls off their feet seems strangely contrived. Kissinger courted his first wife, Ann Fleischer, for seven long years before the two were wed. It was another ten years before their first child was born. Prior to his political stardom, Henry was no Speedy Gonzales.

There have been various descriptions of how at a party given by Barbara Howar for women's lib propagandist Gloria Steinem, Henry referred to himself as a "secret swinger". The phrase swept the cocktail circuit gossip line and stuck. Henry subsequently was able to parlay his self-stimulated reputation into much-photographed evenings with Jill St. John, Marlo Thomas, Hope Lange, Samantha Eggar, and Judy Brown. The latter, who starred in a Danish pornography film entitled "Threesome", enhanced his Don Juan reputation when she called in reporters to discuss their eighteen-month "relationship".

These were part of the boola boola build-up of the man who had the most meteoric rise to power in contemporary American history. Yet there were other, less-flattering descriptions of Henry the K. But the negative comments were overwhelmed by the press-agentry which cast the middle-aged professor in his Superman sex-symbol role.

Writer Noel. E. Parmentel describes how after Ann Fleischer "literally slaved to send him through graduate school", Kissinger browbeat her unbelievably by his abusive screaming and shouting. He was ashamed of *her* New York accent; he told her she embarrassed him in front of "important people". The marriage broke up after fifteen years -- just as Henry began to taste public (and, presumably, private) success.

Friends and ex-associates describe Kissinger as a man who was "openly cruel" to Ann Fleischer, who sulked petulantly whenever he was upstaged, and who ignored anyone who couldn't help him.

A former Kissinger staff member described him this way: "He's got us all buffaloed. He can (and will) lift your security, get you a foundation black ball, bong you at the colleges, put you in Coventry. He's got spies in every department. He's running the Ministry of Fear. All of his phones are tapped and he keeps long dossiers". Another Kissinger ex-staffer added: "In my book Hank Kissinger is a suspicious, fearful misanthrope surrounded by people who are compelled to maintain a low profile to keep their jobs. I'd sooner dig ditches than work for him again."

And there have been even more sinister assessments of the Kissinger psyche. Phyllis Schlafly and Rear Admiral Chester Ward (USN-Ret.) produced an exhaustive study of Kissinger deeds, misdeeds, and mentality. Their 800-page analysis, *Kissinger on the Couch*, concludes that Kissinger is obsessed with both megalomania and defeatism. They contend he is a man so driven by a lust for power that he would lie to anyone, including the President, to achieve a goal.

Former Nixon aide Charles W. Colson, the Watergate victim who spoke out clearly about conspiracy in high places, has said that Nixon told him as early as December 18, 1973, that Kissinger "is really unstable at times". A woman staff assistant at Harvard has recalled: "He appeared to have this fear that other lecturers were laughing behind his back. I feel certain that if a proper mental diagnosis had been made in 1962, he would have been declared sick". This, of course, is the classic description of paranoia.

This was the strangely mercurial, contradictory man to whom Gerald Ford, the unlikely President, turned *immediately* as Nixon prepared to leave the presidency.

How did a German immigrant, who once said his highest ambition was to become an accountant, zoom from academic obscurity to the second most powerful position in the White House -- all within five years?

At first blush, the phenomenon seems as inexplicable as Richard Nixon leaving the tape recorder on.

Can we really believe that President Nixon plucked Henry Kissinger out of the academic ozone, as *Time* reported, just on the basis of having met him at a cocktail party, and remembering reading an earlier Kissinger book?

Is it reasonable to believe that Nixon, a super partisan, would give the position of what amounted to "assistant President in charge of foreign policy" to a Harvard Professor who never claimed to be a Republican? Are we to believe that Nixon was so enraptured by the genius of this man who can hardly speak English that he gave him one of the most important appointments in his administration?

Well, hardly. Nothing about the Kissinger rollercoaster career makes an iota of sense -- not his surprising selection by Nixon as security adviser, not his deliberate acquisition of more power than any similar White House official had ever enjoyed before, not his appointment as Secretary of State, not his survival of the Watergate sweep which eliminated all other Nixon advisers, not his preeminent position in the Ford Administration -- unless we ask who placed Henry Kissinger on his Yellow Brick Road in the first place. Henry was not provided with magic glass slippers by the Witch of the East. He had something better.

Once you strip away all of the puffery, press-agentry, and Madison Avenue hokum which have been erected around the persona of Henry Kissinger, one unmistakable fact emerges: Henry Kissinger is now and, for all of his political life, has been an agent of the mightiest combine of power, finance, and influence in American politics: The House of Rockefeller. (The story of the alarming power and frightening ambition of the House of Rockefeller is told in detail in the *Rockefeller File* by Gary Allen, published earlier this year [1976] by '76 Press.)



Said *U.S. News & World Report* on November 1, 1971: "It was on the advice of Governor Rockefeller, who described Mr. Kissinger as 'the smartest guy available', that Mr. Nixon chose him for his top adviser on foreign policy".

The *Deseret News* had already quoted a Rockefeller aide as saying: "Rocky set up the job for Henry because he. . . thought it might (!) give (Rockefeller) some voice in U.S. foreign policy".

Just as Nixon was packaged and peddled to the American people as a conservative with middle-American values who would stand up to the effete Eastern Establishment, Kissinger -- incredibly enough -- was initially promoted as a conservative and staunch anti-Communist. Erstwhile conservative William F. Buckley, for example, hailed as "a happy office" Nixon's first major appointment, and described the 45-year-old professor Kissinger as "the anti-Communist at Harvard". While Buckley was pleased, his supposed opposites on the Left were gleefully adoring.

Adam Yarmolinsky, the notorious Leftist who was responsible for the appointment of Robert Strange McNamara as Secretary of Defense, declared: "I will sleep better with Henry Kissinger in Washington".

Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. stated: "I think it's an excellent appointment. It's very encouraging. He's the best they'll get."

While the Liberal press went into paroxysms of ecstasy over Nixon's appointment of a Harvard intellectual to the post of Adviser on National Security Affairs, little attention was paid to the fact that Kissinger could not even assume the most sensitive White House job there is, outside of the Presidency itself, until he was given a security waiver by his new boss. The reasons Kissinger could never pass accurate security procedures will be discussed in a subsequent chapter.

Who, after all, *is* Henry Kissinger?

He is not, to begin with, Henry Kissinger. He was born Heinz Alfred Kissinger on May 27, 1923, in Fuerth, Germany, the son of Louis Kissinger, a school teacher and rabbi, and the former Paula Stern. Like many Jewish families feeling the rising impact of Naziism, the Kissinger family fled Germany to the United States in 1938.

Already a skilled debater when he arrived in America at the age of fifteen, Heinz -- now Henry -- did well in rhetoric and other fields as a high school student in New York City. when he graduated with honors, he said that his highest ambition was to be an accountant.

But fate, in the form of World War II, intervened. Drafted into the U.S. Army in 1943 -- a process which also made him an American citizen -- the young Kissinger was "discovered" by a fellow German refugee, Dr. Fritz Kraemer. Kraemer served in American military intelligence and got Kissinger promoted into the 970th counter-intelligence detachment. when hostilities ceased, Kissinger's special position enabled him to become the virtual dictator of a German town, where he commandeered a villa and began living in the grand manner. He administered an entire district and, as a civil service employee, received the then-considerable salary of \$10,000 per year.

Henry ruled his quasi-fiefdom until April 1946, when he was transferred to the European command Intelligence School. (It was during this period as intelligence-gatherer and interrogator, one defecting communist double-agent has claimed, that Kissinger himself was recruited by the KGB and given the code name Bor. More on this in Chapter Eleven.)

After leaving the Army, Kissinger enrolled at Harvard University, majoring in government and securing four scholarships. It can be argued that Heinz, er Henry, had already been tapped by important

people as a man with a future.

Competition for admission to Harvard is always super stiff. But in 1946, with all the veterans trying to squeeze in, it was incredible. Yet, little Heinz, the refugee, not only gained admission but had his education paid in full by multiple scholarships.

Harvard was the turning point in Kissinger's life. (Assuming, of course, that a more sinister turning point had not already occurred in his Army intelligence days in post-war Germany, through a working relationship with Soviet agents.)

With the help of a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation Fellowship for Political Theory, the bright young ex-intelligence officer graduated from Harvard in 1950. but Kissinger did not stop there; he received his MA in 1952 and a doctorate in 1954. His dream of becoming an accountant was obviously fading faster than bookings for a return voyage on the *Titanic*.

Somehow, somewhere, something happened to Herr Kissinger along the academic way. First came the grant from the Rockefellers. Then, while he was working on his Master's, Kissinger was made executive director of the Harvard International Seminar -- a student exchange program which was later found to be financed by the Central Intelligence Agency.

While working toward his doctorate, he was employed on numerous occasions as a consultant for various government agencies. Kissinger apparently made a favorable impression on those members of the Eastern Liberal Establishment who look for reliable bright young men. With the support of his mentor, Professor William Elliott, a well-connected Establishmentarian.

Henry was ushered into that repository of power and prestige, the elusive, secretive Council on Foreign Relations -- perhaps the nation's most important and influential organization. (More about the CFR in the next chapter.)

At the same time, he also became affiliated with the Rockefeller Brothers Trust Fund. For a young German immigrant still hampered by a heavy accent, Kissinger had obviously arrived. If the House of Rockefeller approved him, who would say him *nein*?

Kissinger next was promoted to associate director of Harvard's Center for International Affairs and director of its special Studies Project. In 1956, his fellow harvard alumni and CFR members McGeorge Bundy, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and William Elliott suggested Kissinger become editor of *Foreign Affairs*, the very influential quarterly journal of the Rockefeller's Council on Foreign Relations.

Henry declined the opportunity to polish other men's prose, electing instead to write an analysis of nuclear weapons. The result was Kissinger's first book, *Nuclear Weapons and foreign Policy*, which impressed many persons (including then-Vice President Richard Nixon) and drew supportive comments from such disparate sources as National Review and security risk J. Robert Oppenheimer.

This book has been quoted over and over again by "conservatives" like William F. Buckley who try to pass off Kissinger as an anti-Communist. The truth is that in his second book, *The necessity for Choice*, Kissinger admitted that he had reconsidered his earlier views, and had reached a vastly different conclusion. The result was an espousal of "flexible response" and "limited warfare" and the other cliches which resulted in sending 500,000 men into a no-win war in Vietnam.

With the force of the Rockefeller-CFR propaganda arm behind him, Henry was now attracting national attention in high circles. He was invited to attend the infamous Pugwash Conferences, the "private" Soviet-American meetings sponsored by Soviet apologist Cyrus Eaton.

In later years, the pro-Communist bias of the Pugwash reports would be generally acknowledged, even by Liberals.

Kissinger got into the governmental advisory business under Democratic President John F. Kennedy. He served as a special consultant to JFK during the Berlin crisis and also was appointed to the Arms Control and disarmament Agency.

At the CIA-funded Harvard International Seminar, Kissinger founded a magazine called *Confluence*, which eventually came under the close scrutiny of the Defense Department because of its pro-Communist bias.

If the magazine correctly reflected Kissinger's views, and if his second book corrected his earlier comments on national security *vis-a-vis* the Communists, then Henry put it all together in his third book, *The Troubled Partnership*, published in the mid-60s.

This CFR-sponsored volume in effect called for the merging of the United States with the increasingly socialist nations of Europe into a single nation, as part of what Kissinger called a "Grand Design".

The services Kissinger had begun for Kennedy were continued for his successor. Henry represented the Johnson Administration on three secret missions to Vietnam, two of them to North Vietnam. but while serving these two Democratic presidents, Henry was also the key foreign policy adviser to Republican Nelson Rockefeller.

In fact, it was even reported that Kissinger, who never had a good word to say about Richard Nixon prior to his appointment by him, wept openly when Nelson Rockefeller lost his 1968 bid to garner the Republican nomination for President.

According to an account by United Press International, Kissinger was "reluctant" to accept Nixon's "surprise offer" of a presidential appointment. Rockefeller, K's employer for ten years, made up his mind for him, according to UPI, when he told Henry that if he did not accept it, "never talk to me again".

Later, during a party celebrating Henry Kissinger's fiftieth birthday, Rocky toasted his longtime employee, saying that he'd been associated with him in three Presidential campaigns and "We succeeded in the third. Henry went to the White House".

Henry's sadness at leaving the direct employment of Rockefeller -- a position that had seen his salary jump from \$500 a month in July 1958 to a much more comfortable \$4,000 a month a mere ten years later -- was no doubt partially assuaged by Nelson's parting token of appreciation: a check for \$50,000.

Rockefeller later explained that he wanted to do something to help out a "poor guy faced with tremendous obligations". Of course, if any other billionaire businessman did it, we would call it bribery. with Rockefeller, it's simply a nice gesture.

Keep in mind that the Rockefellers own properties and do business in some 125 separate nations, including the Soviet Union and Red china. Every decision Kissinger would make in Washington was a potential conflict of interest involving his sponsor and benefactor, Rockefeller. Yet, even in the wake of Watergate, when the "gift" was revealed at Rocky's Vice Presidential confirmation hearings, the story caused no more splash than a leaf falling from a tree. The TV anchormen did not even mention it.

In tracing Henry's meteoric rise from obscurity to international acclaim, we see that his magic slippers had the Rockefeller label. From Henry's membership in the Rockefeller's CFR while a professor at Harvard, to his association with a host of Rockefeller-connected activities, to his appointments in

Washington, even to his second marriage, the Rockefeller power, prestige, and influence were paving the way for him.

(Nancy Maginnes, Henry's new wife, was -- and remains -- a Rockefeller employee. The relationship is such a family affair that Nelson even supplied the jet that whisked the couple to their honeymoon retreat, and threw a lavish party for them when they returned to Washington.)

This, then, was the background of Richard Nixon's *most important* appointment. The man selected as chief adviser to the President was a trusted spokesman for the Council on Foreign Relations. In fact, Henry the K was nothing less than an outright Rockefeller agent ready to carry the family's "Grand Design" into the White House.

Kissinger promptly began to centralize his power and to promote his Grand Design. Or, as he and the Rockefellers now call it, the "New World Order". It came as no surprise to Kissinger-watchers when President Nixon reorganized U.S. intelligence operations in 1971 and Kissinger emerged at the pinnacle of power.

Henry had put together the largest team ever to serve the national security adviser. Many of his key aides and assistants were holdovers from the Kennedy-Johnson Administration.

At the 1971 shake-up, Nixon created a special committee to which the CIA director, the Attorney General, the Under-Secretary of State, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff would henceforth report. Chairman of the strategic committee was -- surprise! -- Henry the K.

As the *Los Angeles Times* reported, "efficiency" was not the real reason for the move. The White House was said to be "unhappy" because certain military bureaus -- particularly the Defense Intelligence Agency -- were too "hard-line" in their interpretations of Communist plans, whereas CIA Director Richard Helms, a long-time Kissinger chum, and Kissinger himself could be counted on to take a more *reasonable* view.

In any case, by 1971 Henry had become, as the *Times* noted, virtually "all-powerful in the sprawling sector of the government which seeks to advise the President on national security matters". His dominance of the expanded, 110-member National Security Council was so complete that he controlled every piece of intelligence to reach the President from the State Department, the Defense, Department, and the Central Intelligence Agency.

Never before in the history of the United States had such colossal power been put into the hands of an unelected official. Despite the obvious dangers, the [media](#) were quieter than Charlie McCarthy when Edgar Bergen is away.

It became common knowledge that Kissinger spent more time with the President than any other White House staffer, and the President frequently dropped into his office, less than a half-minute away from his own. Long-time Washington reporter Clark Mollenhoff noted, "Officially, the 47-year-old former Harvard professor of government is the 'Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs' at a salary of \$42,500 a year. But, in fact, he has become the Number Two Man in all matters dealing with the Defense and State Departments".

Numero Uno was of course the President himself, not the man confirmed by the Senate as Secretary of State. It was common knowledge on the Washington cocktail circuit that Kissinger had far more power than the actual Secretary of State, William P. Rogers.

It was in August 1973, during a dip in the presidential pool at Nixon's San Clemente home, that the President finally popped the question to the man who was already Secretary of State in all but name. "If you will let me, I would like to nominate you for Secretary of State tomorrow", *Time* claims was the Nixon approach.

We find it a little hard to believe *Time's* follow-up: "No matter how prepared Henry Kissinger may have been for that moment, it still stunned him."

By the time the question was put to him, the *de facto* Secretary of State was already known as the architect of East-West *detente*, the chief spokesman for appeasement and rapprochement, the man whose "ping-pong diplomacy" secured the opening to Red China, the statesman who would bring peace to Southeast Asia, the brilliant diplomat who would defuse the powder-keggy Middle East.

Kissinger -- *Time* magazine's Man of the Year -- *stunned*? About as stunned as Dean Martin upon being nominated to the Imbibers Hall of Fame.

The next day Kissinger greeted newsmen at the Western White House and demonstrated that modest was still not one of his hallmarks. Asked how he now preferred to be addressed, he replied: "Oh, I don't stand on protocol. If you will just call me Excellency, it will be okay".

Only two members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee even bothered to sit through the two and one-half hours of hearings on the Kissinger nomination as the nation's first foreign-born Secretary of State. Perfunctory approval followed swiftly in the full Senate; the final vote was 78 ayes to 7 nays.

(Henry's strong guttural accent, after more than four decades in the United States, is itself an intriguing mystery. After all, Henry's wheeler-dealer businessman brother Walter speaks English with perfect diction. *TV Guide* reported on January 26, 1974 that "it is believed by some that Kissinger was kept off television for his first two years in the Administration because the White House feared that the German accent would be a poor image".)

Finally, Henry had it made. He was in the limelight now. He ran a vast empire, in name as well as in deed. He presided over 12,000 diplomats, code clerks, economic analysts, linguists, secretaries, and the like. His salary was a comfortable \$60,000 per year. But, ahh, the perquisites, prestige, and power!

During his confirmation hearings, it was revealed that Kissinger headed the most immense intelligence-gathering and policy-determining apparatus in White House history. At the time of the confirmation, Kissinger was: a) head of the national Security Council, b) chairman of every important committee on the Council, c) the man to whom the CIA director reported, and d) chairman of the "Forty" Committee, the "covert operations" arm of the NSC. As Senator Stuart Symington observed to our hero:

"If you stay in two positions, head of State and also head of the National Security Council, you are going to be in a position where you are going to have unprecedented authority never granted to anybody but the President."

And that is just what Kissinger got -- with not a yelp from the fawning media.

The intelligence empire over which Kissinger reigned and reigns is far vaster than just the State Department. It includes some 16 major agencies, with 200,000 employees, a total annual budget in excess of \$6 billion, and controls the most sophisticated gadgetry and computers on the planet.

And there is no doubt at all that Henry wanted every jot and tittle of delicious power and delectable

authority he could get. The *Washington Star* of November 19, 1972 quotes Super K as saying:

"When one holds power in one's hand, and when one holds it formally for quite a long time, you get used to considering it as something you are entitled to have. . . What I am interested in is what you can do with power. You can make marvelous things with it, believe me".

Increasing concern over the amount of power Kissinger possessed, however, caused the Secretary of State to doff his other hat, that as director of the National Security Council, last year. But the fact that the NSC directorship passed to a long-time Kissinger protege, Lt. General Brent Scowcroft, makes the gesture virtually meaningless. Senator Henry M. Jackson, a persistent Kissinger needler, noted that, "Despite the appearances, Kissinger will retain full control of the National Security Council".

And even ultra-Liberal Adlai Stevenson II, the junior Senator from Illinois, observed that "the change is only symbolic".

Ford's swift guarantee of Kissinger's continuance in the White House could only mean one thing: the Grand Design remains in force. The players might change, but the game is the same.

As election year 1976 began, candidate Ford's speeches sounded like replays of 1968 and 1972 -- warmed-over servings of Nixon "conservatism". This was an indirect admission by The Powers That Be of the need to campaign on Middle American ideals, virtues, and traditions.

Or, to put it another way, the only way to con Americans out of their heritage is to promise the Old Time Values while delivering the New World Order.

## Chapter Three

### EXCERPTS:

It can hardly be surprising that Rockefeller's chief foreign policy adviser at the time, one Henry A. Kissinger, later arranged to move President Nixon toward just such accommodation and amalgamation with the Communist world."

Working very hard to implement the CFR's wishes, and hasten the day when its "New World Order" will be a frightening fact, is the man who was plucked from obscurity for just such a mission: Henry A. Kissinger. And having been made a superstar because of his reliability, Henry is unlikely to change sides now. As we shall see, his record shows that he can accomplish wonders -- for his real masters in the Shadow Government."

## KISSINGER AND THE SHADOW GOVERNMENT

"Kissinger has grown up in the foreign policy group which revolves around the Council on Foreign Relations. Here he came to know, and work with, the whole cluster of top men in banking and industry who make up the true core of the so-called 'Eastern Establishment'." So says columnist Joseph Harsch, and of course, he should know, since he is a member of that selfsame CFR.

So much does Kissinger owe to the Council on Foreign Relations that he said at a party honoring a retiring high official of the organization: "You invented me".

Is it significant that the Council on Foreign Relations -- after this abbreviated as CFR -- invented Henry K? It is if you want to understand how the executive branch of the American government is really run.

The CFR, headed by David Rockefeller and under the control of his lieutenants, is America's "Shadow Government" or "Invisible Government". Administrations, both Democrat and Republican, come and go, but as we shall see, the key appointments in both *always* go to members of the mysterious Council on Foreign Relations.

This organization, headquartered in New York City, is composed of an elite of approximately 1,600 of the nation's Establishment Insiders in the fields of high finance, academics, politics, commerce, the foundations, and the communications media. The names of most of its members are household words, but few ordinary Americans have ever heard of this organization. Even fewer are aware of its goals.

Despite the fact that the key moguls of the mass media are members of the CFR, its first fifty years of existence went uncommented except for a single article in *Harper's*, a feature in the *Christian Science Monitor*, and an occasional perfunctory announcement in the New York Times.

Such anonymity can hardly be accidental -- especially when you realize that the membership of the Council on Foreign Relations includes top executives from the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, the *Los Angeles Times*, the *Knight* newspaper chain, *NBC*, *CBS*, *Time*, *Life*, *Fortune*, *Business Week*, *U.S. News & World Report*, and many others.

For several years now a handful of conservative authors has been laboring to expose the activities of the CFR. Until recently these efforts, though cumulative, could be ignored. Four years ago, however, it began to be apparent that George Wallace was planning to seize upon the Council as an electoral issue.

Obviously anticipating this, two very similar articles on the CFR appeared in the *New York Times* and *New York* magazine. The strategy was to admit that the Council on Foreign Relations has long acted as an unelected secret government of the United States, but to maintain that it has voluntarily withdrawn to the sidelines for reasons of altruism.

Contrary to what the *Times* wanted its readers to believe, the CFR (with Kissinger in charge of American foreign policy) was just reaching its zenith of power. Still, as John Franklin Campbell put it in *New York* for September 20, 1971:

Practically every lawyer, banker, professor, general, journalist and bureaucrat who has had any influence on the foreign policy of the last six Presidents -- From Franklin Roosevelt to Richard Nixon -- has spent some time in the Harold Pratt House, a four-story mansion on the corner of Park Avenue and 68th Street, donated 26 years ago by Mr. Pratt's widow (an heir to the Standard Oil fortune) to the Council on Foreign Relations, Inc. . .

If you can walk -- or be carried -- into the Pratt House, it usually means that you are a partner in an investment bank or law firm -- with occasional "trouble-shooting" assignments in government. You believe in foreign aid, NATO, and a bipartisan foreign policy. You've been pretty much running things in this country for the last 25 years, and you know it.

Anthony Lukas, writing in the *New York Times* magazine of November 21, 1971, also admitted that the Insiders of the Council have been responsible for our disastrous foreign policy over the past twenty-five years. Mr. Lukas observed:

From 1945 well into the sixties, Council members were in the forefront of America's

globalist activism: the United Nations organizational meeting in San Francisco (John McCloy, Hamilton Fish Armstrong, Joseph Johnson, Thomas Finletter and many others); as ambassadors to the world body (Edward Stettinius, Henry Cabot Lodge, James Wadsworth and all but three others); the U.S. occupation in Germany (Lucius Clay as military governor, McCloy again and James Conant as High Commissioners); NATO (Finletter again, Harland Cleveland, Charles Spofford as U.S. delegates).

For the last three decades, American foreign policy has remained largely in the hands of men -- the overwhelming majority of them Council members -- whose world perspective was formed in World War II and in the economic reconstructions and military security programs that followed. . .

The Council was their way of staying in touch with the levels of power. . .

Liberal columnist Joseph Kraft, himself a member of the CFR, noted in *Harper's* for July of 1958 that the Council "has been the seat of. . . basic government decisions, has set the context for many more, and has repeatedly served as a recruiting ground for ranking officials." Kraft, incidentally, called his article "School For Statesmen" -- an admission that the members of the Council are drilled with a "Line" of strategy to be carried out in Washington.

In *New York magazine*, Campbell tells of CFR influence in World War II and in post-war planning:

In 1939, with Rockefeller money and the blessings of Secretary of State Cordell Hull, the Council established planning groups on political, economic and strategic problems of the war, which, in 1942, were transferred along with most of their personnel directly into the State Department.

Many of their studies which culminated in the new international institutions of 1945 -- the United Nations, the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund -- began as research efforts at the Council.

When he was chairman of the board of the Council, John J. McCloy wrote a private letter to its members in which he euphemized that

"The Council -- more than any other organization in the foreign field -- has helped leading private citizens to gain an understanding of international problems, and many of them have subsequently used this knowledge as government officials responsible for carrying out United States foreign policy".

Indeed, the CFR has served as a virtual employment agency for the federal government under both Democrats and Republicans. The *Christian Science Monitor* report back in September 1961 confirmed this conclusion:

Because of the Council's single-minded dedication to studying and deliberating American foreign policy, there is a constant flow of its members from private to public service. Almost half of the Council members have been invited to assume official government positions or to act as consultants at one time or another.

Anthony Lukas comments in the *New York Times* magazine:

. . . Everyone knows how fraternity brothers can help other brothers climb the ladder of life. If you want to make foreign policy, there's no better fraternity to belong to than the



Council . . .

When Henry Stimson -- the group's quintessential member -- went to Washington in 1940 as Secretary of War, he took with him John McCloy, who was to become Assistant Secretary in charge of personnel. McCloy has recalled "Whenever we needed a man we thumbed through the roll of the Council members and put through a call to New York".

And over the years, the men McCloy called in turn called other Council members. . . Of the first 82 names on a list prepared to help President Kennedy staff his State Department, 63 were Council members. . .

Indeed, the CFR provided the key men, particularly in the field of foreign policy, for the Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, and now Ford Administrations. As Joseph Kraft phrased it:

"the Council plays a special part in helping to bridge the gap between the two parties, affording unofficially a measure of continuity when the guard changes in Washington."

The following prominent Democrats have been, or now are, agents of the Council on Foreign Relations: Dean Acheson, Alger Hiss, Adlai Stevenson, John Kennedy, Robert Kennedy, Edward Kennedy (Boston Committee), Averell Harriman, George Ball, Henry Fowler, Dean Rusk, Adam Yarmolinsky, Hubert Humphrey, Frank Church, George McGovern and John Lindsay.

Holding the fort for the CFR in the Republican Party have been Dwight Eisenhower, John Foster Dulles, Thomas E. Dewey, Jacob Javits, Robert McNamara, Henry Cabot Lodge, Paul Hoffman, John Gardner, the Rockefellers, Elliot Richardson, Arthur Burns and Richard Nixon.

The *policy-making* power of the CFR is absolutely awesome and yet remains, strangely, virtually unknown to the American public.

*Every* Secretary of State from 1934 to 1976 [in an unbroken line to the present - 2002] (except James Byrnes) has been a member of the Council, as has every Secretary of Defense and every Deputy Secretary of Defense.

In the 44 years from 1928 to 1972, nine out of ten Republican presidential nominees were CFR members, and from 1952 to 1972 a CFR member won every presidential election (except Lyndon Johnson, whose White House staff was nonetheless CFR-dominated).

In half of the presidential campaigns during those same two decades, *both* candidates had been or were CFR members. More than 40 CFR members were among the U.S. delegation to the first United Nations conference in San Francisco, including Soviet agent Alger Hiss.

In the Kennedy-Johnson Administrations, more than 60 CFR members held major policy-making decisions. President Nixon appointed at least 115 members of the Council on Foreign Relations to key posts in his Administration, an all-time high for any President. These included such established Leftists as Charles Yost, Stanley R. Resor, Arthur Burns, Harold Brown, Maxwell Taylor, Lincoln Bloomfield, George A. Lincoln, Henry Cabot Lodge, Robert Murphy, Dr. Frank Stanton, Richard F. Pederson, Alan Pifer, Dr. Paul McCracken, Ellsworth Bunker, Dr. Glenn Seaborg, Joseph Sisco, Jacob Beam, Gerard Smith, and John McCloy.

George Wallace made famous the slogan that at the Presidential level there is not a dime's worth of difference between the Democrat and Republican parties. Many observers have noted that while the two

parties use different rhetoric and aim their spiels at differing segments of the population, it seems to make little difference who wins the election.

The reason for this is that while grass roots Democrats and Republicans generally have greatly differing views on the economy, political policies, and federal activities, as you climb the sides of the political pyramid the two parties become more and more alike. The reason there isn't a dime's worth of difference is that instead of having two distinctly different groups called Democrats and Republicans, we actually have Rockedems and Rockepubs.

Of some 1,600 CFR members, 120 either own or control the nation's major newspapers, magazines, radio and television networks, as well as the most powerful book-publishing companies. The interlock with academia is immense.

As the Schlafly-Ward writing team has noted:

"The Rockefeller clique includes the most influential of the 82 CFR foundation-administration types who have disproportionate influence on what is taught in our universities and over professorial and department appointments."

Plus, CFR members virtually control the major foundations, whose grants quite often are bestowed on persons or groups tied to the CFR. With this group, the "coincidences" are simply astounding.

The Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) has been under virtual CFR control since its creation. Even though James R. Schlesinger, who briefly headed it in 1973, was not a CFR member, he was a protege of CFR man Daniel Ellsberg of "Pentagon Papers" fame, and his appointment was manipulated by the key CFR operative, Henry Kissinger.

Secretaries of State Dean Acheson, John Foster Dulles, Dean Rusk, and Henry Kissinger *all* were CFR members -- all, in fact, worked directly for the House of Rockefeller -- before their appointments to major federal posts.

The balance of the CFR elitist clique is predominantly the big money boys. Of the CFR's 1974 membership, about 90 represented the major Wall Street international banking organizations. In addition, presidents, vice-presidents and chairmen of the boards of most of the giant corporations are members of the CFR.

The Council on Foreign Relations gets little publicity and is virtually unknown to the general public. But it represents Big Government, Big Business, Big Banking, and the Big Media. At the apex of this power elite sits none other than David Rockefeller. And remember, this is the organization which Henry says "invented" him.

Nobody can rationally deny that "our" government has been run by CFR members for many years. They indeed form a shadow government. The question is: Do these CFR members generally share common beliefs and goals?

For the first time we now have an actual member of the CFR who is willing to testify against the organization. He is Admiral Chester Ward, U.S. Navy (Ret.), who as a hot-shot youngish Admiral had become Judge Advocate General of the Navy. As a "man on the rise" he was invited to become a member of the prestigious CFR. The Establishment obviously assumed that Admiral Ward, like so many hundreds before him, would succumb to the flattery of being invited into the inner sanctum and that through subtle appeals to personal ambition he would quickly fall in line.

The Insiders badly underestimated the toughness and stern character of Admiral Ward. He soon became a vocal opponent of the organization. And while the Rockefellers were not so gauche as to remove him from the rolls of the organization, he is no longer invited to attend the private luncheons and briefing sessions. The Admiral states:

The objective of the influential majority of members of CFR has not changed since its founding in 1922, more than 50 years ago. In the 50th anniversary issue of *Foreign Affairs* (the official quarterly publication of the CFR), the first and leading article was written by CFR member Kingman Brewster, Jr., entitled "Reflections on Our National Purpose".

He did not back away from defining it: our national purpose should be to abolish our nationality. Indeed, he pulled out all the emotional stops in a hardsell for global government. He described our "Vietnam-seared generation" as being "far from America Firsters" -- an expression meant as a patronizing sop to our young people. In the entire CFR lexicon, there is no term of revulsion carrying a meaning so deep as "America First".

While CFR members are not robots and may disagree on many minor matters, according to the Admiral, this *lust to surrender* our independence is common to most of them:

"Although, from the inside, CFR is certainly not the monolith that some members and most nonmembers consider it, this lust to surrender the sovereignty and independence of the United States is pervasive throughout most of the membership, and particularly in the leadership of the several divergent cliques. . . "

If the Rockefeller family's CFR has a "lust to surrender the sovereignty and independence of the United States", to whom are we supposed to surrender?

Admiral Ward answers that the goal is the "submergence of U.S. sovereignty and national independence into an all-powerful one-world government". And, according to the Admiral, about 95 percent of the 1,600 members of the CFR are aware that this is the real purpose of the Council -- and support that goal!

The Council on Foreign Relations is the chief tool of the Money Trust in promoting World Government. The late James Warburg (CFR), scion of the international banking family which was principally responsible for the creation of the Federal Reserve System that controls our money, told a Senate Committee on February 17, 1950:

"We shall have world government whether or not you like it -- by conquest or consent."

Most Insiders, however, avoid using the term World Government because it frightens the geese; instead they use code phrases like "new international order" or "new world order". But Nelson Rockefeller spelled out quite clearly what the Insiders mean by "new world order" in this *Associated Press* report dated July 26, 1968:

"New York Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller says as president he would work toward international creation of a 'new world order' based on East-West cooperation instead of conflict. The republican presidential contender said he would begin a dialogue with Red China, if elected, to 'improve the possibilities of accommodations' with that country 'as well as the Soviet Union'."

It can hardly be surprising that Rockefeller's chief foreign policy adviser at the time, one Henry A. Kissinger, later arranged to move President Nixon toward just such accommodation and amalgamation

with the Communist world.

During his trips to both Red China and U.S.S.R., again and again Mr. Nixon called upon the Communists to join him in a "New World Order". The constant repetition of that phrase by members of the CFR strains the possibility of coincidence.

Working very hard to implement the CFR's wishes, and hasten the day when its "New World Order" will be a frightening fact, is the man who was plucked from obscurity for just such a mission: Henry A. Kissinger. And having been made a superstar because of his reliability, Henry is unlikely to change sides now. As we shall see, his record shows that he can accomplish wonders -- for his real masters in the Shadow Government.

## Chapter Four

### EXCERPTS:

But all of this was just the warm-up for the main event. In the early '60s, Congress approved legislation creating something called the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. A program of "general and complete disarmament" became the official policy of the United States.

The entire sequence is a fascinating illustration of how the Shadow Government achieves its aims. The first serious disarmament proposal was produced by the Council on Foreign Relations in 1959. The idea was then discussed at a Pugwash Conference, and, in September 1960, the soviets presented their own disarmament program.

One year later, in September 1961, the Kennedy Administration issued its disarmament proposal, in State Department Publication 7277, [Freedom From War](#).

Now, **here is the clincher**: all four proposals -- from the CFR, the Pugwash Conference, the Soviets, and the State Department -- are virtually identical! For more details on this amazing "coincidence", see Chapter Eight of my previous book, *The Rockefeller File*."

## DESTRUCTION THROUGH *DETENTE*

As America's Bicentennial year began, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger could (and undoubtedly did) take pride in the fact that, almost single-handedly, he had sewn together a new foreign policy for America. Secret deal by secret deal, *detente* had become a reality.

But within a few months, the entire fabric was in danger of being torn to shreds. There were violations and rumors of violations of the Strategic Arms Limitations Talks agreements; voices were heard loudly protesting that the United States was slipping (or may have already slipped) to number two in comparison with Soviet military strength; and other serious charges were aired.

In the face of mounting doubts and criticism that Kissinger's policies had been the best policies for America, President Ford tried to defuse discussion by simply dropping the word "*detente*" from the White House vocabulary. Henceforth, members of the Ford Administration were told, the password is "peace through strength".

Kissinger was not happy with the decision, but agreed to go along with the verbal gymnastics during

an election year. After all, no one had suggested that the policies themselves be changed, merely the pet phrases used to describe them. (According to *Time* magazine, Kissinger complained that the move represented "a petty capitulation to right-wing critics" on the part of the President).

*Detente* has been the foundation of *pax Kissingeriae*, the very cornerstone of the policy Henry Kissinger packaged and sold to Presidents Nixon and Ford. The word itself comes from the French and can mean either a "relaxation of tensions" or a "a trigger". It was the first explanation that was sold to a trusting American public.

We were told that: "The Cold War is over" and "The Communists have mellowed". Like small children, we were lectured, "It's time for a more mature relationship between countries". And above all, we were promised that *detente* would mean a give-and-take, a fair exchange, acceptable accommodation by both sides. In practice, *detente* turned out to be a one-way street benefiting only the Communists. Consider:

In 1968, when the first SALT talks were scheduled, the United States possessed 1,054 intercontinental ballistic missiles; the Soviets had only 850. By 1975, however, the Soviets had 1,618 long-range missiles deployed while we, in turn, still had 1,054. In other words, a five-to-four American advantage had changed to an eight-to-five Soviet superiority. And that's just the beginning.

During those same eight years, the Soviet armed forces had expanded from 1.8 million men to over 2.5 million. Meanwhile, the United States was scuttling the draft and downgrading its own armed services; the result was a drop to military forces from 940,000 men in uniform to less than 790,000.

On the high seas, the Soviets maintain a flotilla of 253 attack submarines, compared to 73 for the United States. They have more than twice as many supply ships as we do -- 2,358 to 1,009. And, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld has estimated the Red lead in tactical aircraft at a ratio of nearly two-to-one.

The Soviet submarine fleet is larger than American, British, and French forces combined. Moreover, the Communists now have the world's *largest* submarines, Delta-class vessels one and one-half times longer than a football field; each one is equipped with twelve tubes for firing nuclear missiles. (The missiles, incidentally, have a range of some 4,000 miles. And with such subs now patrolling off our Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf coasts, there is not a town in America that is not within range of Soviet nuclear missiles this very evening.)

Meanwhile, in this era of *detente*, other parts of our military arsenal are allowed to rust away. Prior to the advent of Henry the K, the U.S. could deploy 434 major combat ships. Today, that number has been cut almost in half, to only 253. Even more alarming, Congressman Les Aspin told his colleagues in the House on February 3, 1976 that because of poor maintenance, only thirty percent of U.S. Navy vessels can meet "the standard of full combat readiness". Moreover, the Congressman said, nearly half the Navy's 7,400 aircraft are unprepared and unequipped for hostile action.

While British authority Captain John Moore, in the book *The Soviet Navy Today* (published in January 1976), says that the Soviet Navy's firepower is "the most potent of any fleet that ever existed", the U.S. fleet is the smallest and weakest it has been at any time since 1939. Moore estimates that the United States is presently at least seven to eight years behind the Communists, and we are falling further behind every week.

The Red Navy dominates the North Sea, patrols the Arctic and the Antarctic, is "strongly present" in the Atlantic and Pacific, controls Sweden's sea outlets of Skagerrak and Kattegat, and is heavily and visibly present in the Mediterranean and Arabian Seas, the Indian Ocean, the Persian Gulf, and off both

coasts of Africa.

The Soviets scored a major victory in 1975 without flexing a muscle, when Henry the Knife ordered the \$6 billion anti-ballistic missile defense complex in North Dakota shut down. The ABM complex had been operational *for only one month* when it was decided, in the spirit of *detente*, that it could be scrapped.

Coming at a time when the Russians were improving and modernizing their own anti-ballistic missile system, the move left the United States with no protection against Soviet or Chinese missiles. Super K has already been quoted as saying that Red China and the Soviet Union are no longer "revolutionary" states. As the Secretary sees it, the two Communist giants "no longer entertain ambitions to destroy the existing international order".

Soviet party chief Leonid Brezhnev has a slightly different perspective. He told a meeting of the Politburo in 1974:

"We Communists have got to string along with the capitalists for a while. We need their agriculture and their technology. But we are going to continue massive military programs. . . (soon) we will be in a position to return to a much more aggressive foreign policy designed to gain the upper-hand. . . "

We do not believe that the United States must match the Soviets man for man, tank for tank, or even ship for ship in order to protect itself. Today, technology is the equalizer that the Colt .45 was in the old West.

Possibly the ultimate equalizer, the one which could guarantee our safety, is the cruise missile. This nuclear warhead is small enough to be launched from almost anywhere, powerful enough to fly 2,000 miles or more, and accurate enough to strike within 100 feet of its target.

Now, here is the punch line: Henry Kissinger has offered to bargain away even this ultimate weapon at the SALT table!

Under the circumstances, it can come as no surprise that an analysis of our military preparedness, undertaken by the non-partisan Library of Congress, warns that the balance of military power is shifting strongly in favor of the Soviet Union. The report was prepared for the Senate Armed Services Committee. released to the public in February 1976, it states that unless current policies are reversed, the United States will have to reassess its position as a global power!

While the crippling of our military position by our detente-minded Secretary of State was becoming an open scandal in Washington, another shock wave hit the Capitol. In late February 1976, it was confirmed that previous estimates by the CIA of Soviet military expenditures were fifty percent too low.

At the beginning of this election year, world renowned nuclear physicist Edward Teller warned that the United States was already a clear second to the Soviet Union in military strength. "We would have no chance against Russia if there was a conflict now", he said. Dr. Teller added he believed it would take us ten years to surpass the Soviets even if present policies are changed.

By now you may be asking, what in God's name has happened during the past eight years? How did an eight-to-one American military superiority over the Communists vanish in less than a decade?

*Detente's* disastrous roots stretch back at least thirty years, to Yalta and similar post-World War II concessions to the Communists. Trying to explain why he had been so incredibly generous to Soviet

strongman Stalin, a sick and war-weary Franklin D. Roosevelt told our Ambassador to Moscow, William C. Bullitt:

"I have a hunch that Stalin. . . does not want anything but security for his country, and I think that if I give him everything I possibly can and ask for nothing from him in return, he won't try to annex anything and he will work with me for a world of peace and harmony."

Roosevelt's wishful dream of "a world of peace and harmony" was forgotten during the Soviet conquest of Eastern Europe and the Communist Chinese assault on Korea.

{NOTE: Historical books that have been suppressed from the public are replete with accounts of FDR's treasonous actions dealing with the U.S.S.R. That would belie a sentiment claiming he 'dreamed of a world of peace and harmony', other than the 'peace' sought by Zionist/Bolshevist Globalists: a world without resistance to their planned tyrannical World Government. - JP - transcriber}

But by the mid-1950s the peacemongers were setting up shop once again. One of the most important operations was something known as the Pugwash Conferences. Officially described as "Joint Conferences on Science and World Affairs" between Russian and American scientists and intellectuals, the first meeting took place in 1957 at the Pugwash, Nova Scotia home of the notorious Soviet apologist, Cyrus Eaton.

Since then, more than twenty "Pugwash Conferences" have been held, most of them outside the United States and all of them financed by the tax-exempt Rockefeller-CFR foundations. An active participant in those early meetings was Henry A. Kissinger.

The Pugwash Conferences did not push *detente*, but only because the word had not been coined back then. The pet phrase of the conferees was "disarmament". It was at these meetings that the framework for the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty was constructed.

Remember the first test Ban Treaty? The Soviets signed it and paid lip service to it for almost a year -- while they made secret preparations for the mightiest series of nuclear tests they had ever conducted. While most Americans were still in shock because of the Communists' blatant deceit, another test ban treaty was prepared in 1963. This one froze the advantages that the Soviets had gained by betraying the first one -- and guaranteed that the United States would not conduct additional nuclear tests.

Over vociferous protests from countless Americans, the United States signed the second Nuclear Test Ban Treaty as well. Professor Kissinger and his crowd were delighted.

But all of this was just the warm-up for the main event. In the early '60s, Congress approved legislation creating something called the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. A program of "general and complete disarmament" became the official policy of the United States.

The entire sequence is a fascinating illustration of how the Shadow Government achieves its aims. The first serious disarmament proposal was produced by the Council on Foreign Relations in 1959. The idea was then discussed at a Pugwash Conference, and, in September 1960, the Soviets presented their own disarmament program.

One year later, in September 1961, the Kennedy Administration issued its disarmament proposal, in State Department Publication 7277, [Freedom From War](#).

Now, here is the clincher: all four proposals -- from the CFR, the Pugwash Conference, the Soviets, and the State Department -- are virtually identical! For more details on this amazing "coincidence", see

Chapter Eight of my previous book, *The Rockefeller File*.

The first Secretary of Defense to implement this policy was CFR member Robert S. McNamara, who held office from 1961 through 1968. During that time, he succeeded in reducing our nuclear striking force by fifty percent; scrapping three-quarters of our multi-megaton missiles and half of the Minuteman missiles; blocking development of the B-70 strategic bomber after it had proven its effectiveness; cancelling the Skybold, Pluto, Dynasoar, and Orion missile systems; and mothballing much of the sea and air fleets he inherited.

In fact, McNamara destroyed more operational U.S. strategic weapons than the Soviets could have destroyed in a full-scale nuclear attack!

{NOTE: It was also McNamara who recalled (three times) the fighter jets sent out from the USS Saratoga to come to the aide of their brothers on the USS Liberty when they and it were attacked by the Israelis during the six-day war in 1967. Because of McNamara's orders 34 American sailors were killed; over 170 were injured and maimed; the ship was damaged beyond repair. - JP - transcriber}

All of these accomplishments would pale in comparison to what Henry the K would accomplish for the disarmament lobby during the next eight years, however. The intellectual with the heavy accent and even heavier connections had come a long way, baby, since those first Pugwash Conferences.

The Strategic Arms Limitations Talks, or SALT 1, were Henry's first big opportunity. Curiously, had it not been for the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, the talks would have been over before he was in office. The first SALT conference was originally scheduled to be held in July 1968. When Soviet tanks rumbled into Czechoslovakia, however, to crush the "liberal spring" of Alexander Dubcek (only two weeks after Soviet officials had signed the Declaration of Bratislava, guaranteeing Czech independence!), it was decided to postpone the SALT meetings until November 1969.

Having gotten his big chance, Henry was not going to let anyone else interfere with his operation. At the SALT talks, Henry the K no longer was an understudy. Suddenly he had a starring role. And he was not about to let anyone else share the spotlight with him.

In his book *Cold Dawn*, the behind-the-scenes story of SALT, John Newhouse portrays Kissinger as secrecy obsessed, suspicious of his own staff, and constantly scheming to grasp more power and control over other positions and personnel. Ultimately, Henry the Knife would successfully emerge as the *sole* American architect of SALT.

Even such long-time and influential Liberals as Paul Nitze and Gerard Smith found it impossible to get along with fellow-CFR member Kissinger. Nitze, the senior delegate at earlier SALT conferences, had such serious disputes with Kissinger that he quit the delegations. Smith, head of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, had been the chief U.S. arms negotiator before Kissinger came along.

When Henry did not even consult with him during the last twenty days of negotiations -- preferring secret deals directly with the Soviets -- Smith blew his top. But in the end, it was Smith, not Kissinger, who was "retired" from his position. In short, at SALT it was Henry Kissinger, and no one else, who arranged America's terms. Just what kind of a deal did he endorse? In their exhaustive 800-page analysis, *Kissinger on the Couch*, authors Phyllis Schlafly and Chester Ward say that SALT 1 was incredibly slanted to favor the Soviets:

Every single key provision of both SALT agreements originated with Soviet strategic experts and planners in the Kremlin, was approved by Leonid Brezhnev and his closest associates in the Politburo, and was passed -- usually by Soviet Ambassador Anatoly.



dobrynin --to Henry Kissinger, who then provided the rationalization for it and "sold" it to President Nixon.

Kissinger not only accepted Soviet dictation of all the key provisions of the agreements, but sold them to President Nixon and the nation by providing rationalizations he knew were misleading. That is to say, he was working with the Soviets and against the United States of America. He was deliberately and elaborately deceiving the American people, Congress, and probably the President with his cunning charade. . .

All the substantive provisions of both, SALT I agreements were in fact dictated by the Kremlin and secretly accepted by Henry Kissinger without the participation of the U.S. SALT delegation.

Just how bad were the SALT agreements? Unless you are a paranoid masochist, with a secret lust to see this Republic destroyed, they are a *disaster*. The SALT I Treaty, which Henry the K so proudly exhibited, granted the Soviets a 41-percent superiority in land-based missiles, a 94-percent superiority in sea-based missiles, and a 50-percent superiority in submarines.

Senators Barry goldwater and John Tower joined other legislators in warning that the agreements *guarantee* the Communists a four-to-one advantage over the U.S. in missile payload capability; permit the Reds to continue building nuclear submarines while blocking us from doing the same; and, assure the Soviets of a three-to-two advantage in the number of missiles deployed.

General Bruce K. Holloway, former Commander-in-Chief of the Strategic Air Command, stated in 1971 that "The U.S.S.R. exceeds us in every offensive and defensive strategic weapon system, except missile submarines." This one slight advantage is rapidly disappearing, thanks to Secretary Kissinger.

Even though the SALT I accord was slanted in the Soviets' favor on every important point, apparently this was not enough for the Communists. For the signatures of the signers barely had time to dry before reports began leaking out of Washington that the Russians, once again, were cheating.

The only surprise would have been if the Communists had kept their word. Out of seventeen previous agreements with the U.S. relating to arms and defense, the Soviets have broken every single one.

The big story, however, was not that the Communists had violated yet another agreement -- such disparate sources as muckraking columnist Jack Anderson and the respected trade journal *Aviation Week & Space Technology* agreed on that -- but that Secretary of State Henry Kissinger was deceiving the public, and perhaps even the President, about such violations.

- Former chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Elmo R. Zumwalt Jr., a vocal and persistent critic of detente, charged that Kissinger:
- Withheld from the Congress at least five intelligence reports of possible Soviet violations;
- Instructed intelligence officials to avoid any written statements that could be interpreted as suggesting the Communists had violated the agreements'
- Deliberately misled then-Secretary of State William P. Rogers about the nature and extent of Soviet abuses of the SALT agreement;
- Ordered the Voice of America to edit out of its Eastern European broadcasts anything unfavorable to the soviet Union;

- Carried on secret discussions with soviet officials regarding "loopholes" in the present accords as well as plans for future disarmament measures;
- Persuaded President Ford to claim that the Standing Consultative Group, established under the SALT 1 pact, would investigate any complaints of violations, although as chief negotiator of the agreement he knew that the group could do no such thing.

"The Soviets have violated the basic contracts, the attached protocols, the agreed interpretations, and the unilateral declarations", Zumwalt charged. "The U.S. has protested to the SCG. That group -- the President's answer notwithstanding -- is not an investigative or fact-finding body, nor can it form conclusions about violations. . . The evidence from the intelligence community is inarguable. . . the Soviets have lied to us."

According to the Admiral, it is not just the Soviets who deliberately distort the truth. In February 1976, the San Francisco Chronicle carried some major revelations by Zumwalt of conversations he had with Kissinger six years earlier. In notes he made at the time, Admiral Zumwalt wrote:

"K feels the U.S. has passed its historic high point like so many earlier civilizations. He believes the U.S. is on the downhill. . .

He states that his job is to persuade the Russians to give us the best deal we can get, recognizing that the historical forces favor them. He says that in the light of history, he will be recognized as one of those who negotiated terms favorable to the Soviets, but that the American people have only themselves to blame because they lack the stamina to stay the course against the Russians, who are Sparta to our Athens."

The Secretary of State branded Zumwalt's revelations as "contemptible falsehoods". The Admiral responded: "Kissinger's answer is just one more indication that liars lie."

If we score each year of the Kissinger Era as one round in the match between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., the total in this Bicentennial election year stands at East 8, West 0. In Germany, the 1970 treaties with Russia and Poland negotiated by Willi Brandt and the 1971 agreement on Berlin were clear victories for the Communists. In conferences involving Warsaw Pact and NATO forces, the Soviet bloc almost without exception has come out ahead. In terms of aid and trade, the Communists have made out like the bandits they are. And in discussions of arms limitations, as we have seen, *pax Kissingeriae* has meant a clean sweep for the Communists.

Perhaps the Reds' clearest victory, at least psychologically, occurred in Helsinki, Finland in July 1975, when President Ford, on behalf of the United States, signed a document supposedly drafted by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, but actually prepared by Henry Kissinger and his soviet comrades.

The Helsinki Declaration is nothing less than a complete and shameful betrayal of Soviet-occupied Eastern Europe. It sanctions the rape of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the other Soviet satellites. It puts the U.S. stamp of approval on the Communist conquest of one-half of Europe.

Meanwhile, Dr. Kissinger has managed to eliminate any opposition within the Executive Branch to his plans for a New World Order. And he is not always very subtle about it. When Admiral Zumwalt was invited to appear on "Meet The Press" two years ago [1975], Kissinger (operating through Defense Secretary James Schlesinger) ordered the Admiral not to participate in the panel show.

When Zumwalt pointed out that he had retired from the government and was not subject to Dr. K.'s

commands, Henry the Knife then threatened to have him court-martialed. A compromise was finally reached, permitting Zumwalt to appear as scheduled, so long as he promised *not* to discuss the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks.

Schlesinger himself did not last long enough at the Pentagon to gain any seniority. He was fired by President Ford in November 1975 because of "growing tensions" between himself and the Secretary of State. A few days later, Kissinger's satisfied smirk must have spread when he learned that Lt. Gen. Daniel O. Graham, Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, had also submitted his resignation.

While neither Schlesinger or Graham could be described as hard-nosed conservatives, both men had expressed serious reservations about *detente*, and both men were openly alarmed about the Soviets' massive military build-up. But apparently the watchword in Washington is, "You don't have to agree with everything Super K does; just don't *disagree* with anything!"

Meanwhile, the Soviets continue to increase their military posture at a furious pace. Malcolm R. Currie, a director of research for the Defense Department, told a Senate Committee in February 1976 that the Communists have launched "a large and determined effort, and the Soviets are inexorably increasing their level of technology. . . ."

Currie cited the following Soviet gains during the past year:

- Rapid progress in high-accuracy guidance for new intercontinental ballistic missiles;
- Intensive research in an anti-ballistic missile program;
- New developments in underseas surveillance and strategic air defense systems;
- An aggressive space program that saw the Russians launch eight times more military spacecraft in 1975 than the United States did;
- Development of two new kinds of satellites for ocean surveillance, "possibly to provide targeting information for attack submarines and guided-missile ships".

In other words, while the United States has stood still (and in some areas has slipped backwards), the Soviets have been aggressively moving forward. The situation has become so critical that the normally restrained writing team of Admiral Chester Ward and Phyllis Schlafly have accused Henry Kissinger of making "the entire population of the United States hostages to the Kremlin".

Unless our egotistical and surrender-prone Secretary of State is stopped, they warn, "We will have been set up for mass murder on a scale never before witnessed in the history of the world."

Although we certainly do not question the facts that Admiral Ward and Mrs. Schlafly have assembled, we do not share their conclusions. While it is possible that Henry the K is setting us up for nuclear annihilation, we think it is far more probable that the real purpose is not nuclear bombs, but nuclear blackmail.

Why is the United States being disarmed? The answer, we believe, is that the way is being prepared for a New World Order ultimatum. It will be hailed as "the best deal we can get" by Kissinger and the network media boys -- who have remained deaf, dumb, and blind while the situation was being set up. The Communists are working hand-in-hand with internationalists in our own country.

When the former are strong enough, thanks to Henry K, the latter (led, not so coincidentally, by Henry

K) will insist we must scrap our national sovereignty and merge into a One World Government.

The entire scenario is in keeping with a statement made to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee more than twenty-five years ago by international banker and CFR potentate James Warburg. He said, "We will have world government whether or not you like it -- by conquest or consent."

The Shadow Government has been working for just such a conclusion to American independence for many years. It would not be accurate to blame Henry Kissinger for creating all of these policies; he has simply been the master architect in finalizing the destruction of our defensive capability. He is the undisputed champion of creating, crafting and selling the disarmament of the United States in what he believes will be the final period of our independence.

But disarming the United States is only half of the plot. Just as significant, and even less publicized, is the lengthy history of Western aid to the Soviet Union, which began almost as soon as the Bolsheviks seized power. It is not the purpose of this volume to substantiate how the West, particularly the United States, literally has created the industrial-military complex of the Soviet Union.

The fascinating, almost unbelievable saga has been chronicled elsewhere. (See "Building the Big Red Machine" in the author's previous book, *The Rockefeller File*, as well as the series of important studies on this subject by Professor Antony C. Sutton.)

The point was driven home with cruel irony during the Vietnam War, when the Soviet bloc provided 80 percent of the war materials for North Vietnam -- materials that were used against Americans and South Vietnamese in the field at the very time American supplies were being unloaded at Soviet ports and the U.S. was helping construct the largest truck-building complex in the world in Russia!

Thousands of items with strategic applications were cleared for shipment to the Communists while U.S. credits, subsidized by taxpayers, financed the purchases.

The Soviet Union, in the era of detente as before, has needed Western technology and Western foodstuffs to survive. It has been getting both, largely through the ingenious method of having the U.S. taxpayers finance the long-term, low-interest loans necessary so the Russians could purchase such goods.

The Export-Import Bank (ExIM) has loaned the Soviets hundreds of millions of dollars and Senator Harry F. Byrd of Virginia has warned, "It appears that loans in the billions are in the works".

While Americans must pay ten percent, twelve percent, or more for loans, ExIm lends the Reds money at six percent interest. The banks handling the deals, and the businessmen selling the goods, make a windfall, but it is the American citizens ultimately who pay the cost. The industrialization of Communist Russia has, in no small part, been financed by U.S. taxpayers precisely in this fashion.

The fact that the Soviet Union exceeds the U.S. in steel output is in no small part due to the investments there by U.S. and other Free World firms. The largest iron and steel plant in the world was built in the U.S.S.R. by the American-based McKee Corporation. The Soviet Union is now the world's major producer of oil, due to the development of the Russian oil and gas potential by Western, primarily American, interests.

During the past three years, while Soviet-supplied forces were completing their conquest of Southeast Asia, the United States was building the largest truck factory in the world -- on the Kama River in Russia. During the same time we were financing, building and equipping the largest tanker shipyard in the world. . . on the Black Sea; the largest fertilizer complex in the world. . . on the Volga River; and a very large

chemical plant -- at Severodonetz.

In April 1975 the Ford Administration actually licensed the sale to the Soviet Union of eleven advanced-design giant IBM computers. Within days of this deal, it was announced that a bank consortium (made up of the cream of CFR-connected wheelers and dealers) was lending the Soviet Union \$250 million "with no strings attached to the loan".

And that very same day, Bank of America announced it had another syndicate ready to lend the U.S.S.R. \$500 million. Do you begin to detect a pattern in all of this?

Secretary of State Kissinger acknowledged the obvious last year when he said that "the Soviet Union is much more interested in credits than in trade, because for the next five years Russia will have little to give in reciprocal trade".

What Henry didn't say was that, given past performances, the Soviet Union had everything to gain and nothing to lose by such deals. After all, it was *detente*-minded boys in the State Department who earlier had agreed to allow the Soviets to pay off an \$11 billion World War II Lend-Lease debt for a mere \$722 million, or seven cents on the dollar. True to form, the Communists paid only \$32 million, then reneged on the rest.

Admiral Elmo Zumwalt has described the situation in this hardly flattering but frankly accurate passage:

"The Soviets see the United States right now as a great placid bovine chewing its cud in the sun and with two huge udders extended to them, one labeled grain and the other labeled technology. It stands there letting itself be milked dry, twitching its tail contentedly, too lazy and too placid to notice."

Of the myriad deals Herr Kissinger has arranged for his Soviet friends in the past eight years, only one almost became a public scandal. It wasn't all that more important than the Secretary's other pacts and promises, it was just a lot more obvious.

We're referring, of course, to the "great grain robbery" of 1972. It was a performance that made the Brink's robbery seem like a kindergarten heist of four marbles and one slightly licked lollipop.

Before most Americans knew what was happening, the Soviets had purchased a whopping twenty-five percent of the U.S. wheat crop at bargain-basement prices. The sale created a wheat shortage in the United States, with the result that bread prices suddenly shot through the ceiling. But that was just part of the story. We financed the loan, so the Soviets could make the purchase, and we also subsidized the freight to get the grain to them.

Kissinger followed up this Soviet success with a five-year agreement, signed in October 1975, which entitles the Soviets to buy a minimum of six million metric tons of U.S. grain annually, beginning with the 1976 crop year. It is a "swap deal" -- we are supposed to keep the usually empty Soviet larder stocked, while in return the Soviets will sell us ten million metric tons of oil and oil products each year.

Part of the deal allows the Russians to buy up to seven million more tons of U.S. grain before the five-year agreement takes effect in the fall of 1976. Oren Staley, President of the national Farmers Organization, called the deal an "outrageous interference with American farmers' free markets." Staley said the agreement represented "government dictatorship with a vengeance" and added that American farmers have been "lied to, betrayed and sold down the river".

While Russia was placing orders for American wheat, American corn, and American rice, food prices

in the U.S. were rising 29 percent in two years. Under the circumstances, it was indeed strange to see Kissinger and his cronies begging the Communists to cart away American grain.

But the madness of *detente* did not stop there. By 1975 it reached such ridiculous extremes as the U.S. government authorizing a private American firm to sell two sets of plans for a sophisticated new cargo ship to the Soviets for \$500,000 each -- *after* the Defense Department had invested \$57.5 million in the project. And on and on it goes.

Our Kissinger-arranged deals with Red China are cut from the same cloth as our "trade" with the Soviet bloc; we have made numerous concessions and have asked for none in return.

What does the building of the Big Red Machine in the Soviet Union and Red China mean? Constructing some of the world's largest factories for the Soviet Union, and shipping them the most sophisticated U.S. technology and equipment, has many implications.

Professor Antony Sutton, the worlds' foremost expert on the use of Western technology to develop the Soviet Union, has written an entire book on this subject under the provocative but very deliberate title, *National Suicide*.

The military potential of the industrial plants which we are building for the Soviets should be obvious to anyone. Trucks, aircraft, oil, steel, petro-chemicals, aluminum, computers -- these are the very sinews of a military-industrial complex. These factories, the product of American genius and financed by American capital, could have been built in the United States. Instead, they are constructed *at U.S. taxpayers' expense* in the Soviet Union -- a nation whose masters still keep millions in concentration camps and who have sworn to bury us.

Another important thing to remember is the strong possibility that Russian factories using American capital and American technology will, with Soviet slave labor, produce goods which will undersell those produced by American labor in world markets. Just as many thousands of Americans have already lost their jobs to foreign labor working in European and Asian factories constructed with American foreign aid.

This point has not been lost on AFL-CIO chieftain George Meany, who succinctly summed up his feelings about the continuing giveaway of grain, technology, defense, secrets, and jobs:

"We don't want any part of it. We're not interested in seeing cheap goods made by Soviet slave labor pour into this country. We are not interested in seeing American workers displaced by slave labor."

Testifying at a Congressional hearing on *detente*, Meany also assailed the Export-Import Bank for its giveaway credit rates:

"What American can get a loan at six percent? This isn't trade. This is a welfare program for Russia."

But as important as jobs are, there is even a more important aspect to our aid to the Communists. At stake is the very survival of our freedom and independence.

Professor Sutton has assembled an abundance of evidence which nobody has even attempted to refute. First, he has shown that Communism is a stagnant system incapable of innovation or high productivity. Its survival, even at a subsistence level for its captives, has required regular transfusions of capital and technology. Without aid from the West, the Soviet Union would have long since collapsed.

The Soviet Union was first saved by Herbert Hoover with food. Next came Lenin's New Economic Plan, which let the super-capitalists back into Russia. This was followed by FDR's diplomatic recognition of Russia, which allowed the Soviets to obtain desperately needed credits. [World War II turned on the \\$11billion Lend-Lease](#) spigot.

Following the war, Russia was allowed to denude much of Germany of factories and scientists. During the Kennedy Administration we started providing wheat for hungry Soviet factory workers. During the Vietnam War, America shipped vital supplies to the East European bloc, which was providing North Vietnam with the war equipment to kill our own soldiers. Now we are supplying the world's largest truck factory, extremely sophisticated computers, and a cornucopia of other manufacturing technology.

To cap this incredible recitation, the *Wall Street Journal* of April 15, 1975, headlined: "U.S. Quietly Allows Uranium Shipments to Soviet Union for Processing Into Fuel." Is that unbelievable?

Perhaps the most eloquent opponent of detente is the exiled Soviet author Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn. He has asked:

"What does the spirit of Helsinki and the spirit of *detente* mean for us within the Soviet Union? The strengthening of totalitarianism. What seems to you to be a milder atmosphere is for us the strengthening of totalitarianism."

And he adds:

"You think that this a a respite, but it is an imaginary respite. It's a respite before destruction. As for us, we have no respite at all. We're being strangled even more, with greater determination. . . ."

Solzhenitsyn visited the United States in 1975. He was here at the very time of the Soviet-American joint space flight and the "handshake in space". His every word, both spoken and written, his very presence branded as a lie the Kissinger-Rockefeller-CFR policies. A man who could testify from first-hand experience in the *Gulag Archipelago* that Communism was not mellowing was a distinct embarrassment to the Washington Establishment.

Secretary Kissinger advised President Ford that Solzhenitsyn's views endangered the stable relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. Henry the K -- who had smilingly shaken hands with the most vicious tyrants and bloodiest murderers in history -- refused to meet the Nobel Laureate. Henry the Knife advised the President not to meet with him, either, so the White House snubbed this distinguished champion of freedom.

The Kissinger-Ford team ignored a man who supports traditional American principles, for the sake of some "allies" who have sworn they will bury us.

And once again we must ask, whose side is Henry on, anyway?

## Chapter Five

### EXCERPTS:

There may, of course, be an even more sinister reason for the Red China gambit. It is the reason which

underlies so much of the frenetic surface activity of the Shadow Government: **control of the world's energy resources.**

As Congressman John Rarick reported in July 1971:

"Also early in April, reports were leaked concerning rich oil discoveries in the Asian Pacific area, including areas claimed by Red China. Mentioned among the oil exploration companies were those represented at the hush-hush Bilderberger meeting. Then in June, we were advised that Chase Manhattan Bank was ready to invest \$6 million in oil exploration and predicted \$250 billion in Free World investment in the Asian Pacific area up to 1980."

Later in the year, newspapers reported that a "fantastic exploration race" was underway in the Far East.

## THE RED CHINA GAMBIT

Sixteen years ago Henry A. Kissinger was as worried about the rulers of Red China as any other American boy. He wrote at the time:

"The prospect that China by 1978 might have the nuclear capability of the Soviet Union in 1960 is terrifying. Many of the notions of nuclear deterrence may not apply with respect to a country which has shown so callous a disregard of human life."

A callous disregard for human life? If any group has ever merited such a label, it is the Communist leaders of mainland China, who butchered between 30 and 60 million of their own people to consolidate their power! But twelve years later, how things have changed.

"We accept now. . . in the light. . . of improvement in relations with the People's Republic of China, that we could pay this price of foregoing the additional protection that the President requested in his original statement",

Henry cooed in 1972. And he added,

"The idea of a third nuclear country attacking the United States is a rather remote possibility".

The rulers of Red China had not changed one iota in the past twelve years. But Henry had swiveled 180 degrees. What did it mean?

On July 1, 1971, Special Assistant for National Security Affairs, Henry Kissinger and party, left Andrews Air Force Base near Washington aboard a huge, almost windowless, KC-135, the military version of the Boeing 707. Henry was joined by Harold Saunders, one of his deputies; John Holdridge, a member of his staff specializing in Far Eastern affairs; Winston Lord, a special assistant; Richard Smyser, a foreign service officer and expert on Southeast Asia; and two Secret Service agents.

(A few months earlier, Smyser had made headlines of another sort, when he was the host of a rather unusual affair in Washington. Ties were optional at Smyser's soiree, but trousers were not. Men were not allowed to wear any pants at his party. One guest went so far as to arrive at the "trouserless orgy", as one commentator called it, dressed in drawers made from an American flag. Smyser made him feel right at home.)

Their ostensible destination, at least as far as Washington press releases were concerned, was South Vietnam and several other Far Eastern countries. But the ten-day "fact-finding" trip had a far more



sinister purpose.

The Kissinger party "vanished" during the stopover in Pakistan. It was said that Kissinger had become "slightly indisposed" and had gone to a remote hill station 60 miles north of Rawalpindi "to recuperate".

Instead, on July 9, the Kissinger party secretly flew another 2,300 miles, from Pakistan to Peking, and began a precedent-setting 49-hour visit with the leaders of Communist China -- the first official-level contacts with the mainland since it had been seized by the Communists 22 years before.

It was the first in a series of nine trips by Henry Kissinger to Red China. It was certainly his most spectacular diplomatic coup thus far. It unquestionably signaled a major change in the course of American foreign policy.

The Peking gambit set the stage for the visit by President Richard Nixon. It anticipated other Kissinger trips, and also laid the groundwork for a visit by President Gerald Ford. It began the alleged "thaw" in American-Red Chinese relations, which was paralleled by the abandonment of the Republic of China and the ouster of that World War II ally, a founder of the United Nations, from that world body.

Kissinger's secret, surprise visit established the foundation for trade relations between the U.S. and Peking and, perhaps most important of all, it provided an immeasurable amount of *face* throughout the Orient for the Red Chinese leaders.

Everything about the opening to Red China was done in secret. We have yet to be informed how the opening came about, what deals were made during the lengthy chats between Henry Kissinger and the Red Chinese leaders (and later between the two American Presidents and their Red Chinese hosts), or what the ultimate price of this "opening" will be. The "opening" began in secret, with clandestine conferences, and the secrecy continues even now.

Kissinger clearly sees his role in the Red China opening as one of the hallmarks of his White House career, an act so momentous that he would ignore the American debacle in Vietnam, which ended in total disaster for the United States, as an unimportant footnote in comparison to the rapprochement with Red China.

In twelve years, Kissinger's public utterances had flip-flopped from concern about callous leaders with nuclear weapons to saccharin eulogies of mass murderers Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai.

The willingness, even eagerness, of American leaders to hop into bed with a regime whose history of human brutality, mass executions, mass murder, and imposition of terror has no par in modern human history, was one of the most shameful events of a shame-filled decade.

Curiously enough, it has recently been reported that Richard Nixon's first major directive to his first major appointment concerned precisely such a development. We are now told that within his first twelve days in office, Nixon told Kissinger to draw up plans for a way to achieve a Peking-Washington rapprochement. But where did the idea *really* originate?

Depending on who is doing the counting, the most conservative estimates are that Communist Chinese leaders carried out the deliberate murders of from 34 million to 64 million helpless victims during the takeover of the mainland, the subsequent purges, and the "great cultural revolution" of the 1960s. Alongside such astronomical totals, even the figures of Nazi atrocities pale in comparison. (Figures are from "The Human Cost of Communism", a report of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.)

As far back as November 1959, Nelson Rockefeller, then governor of New York, was telling students

in a University of Oregon speech that the United States should establish "intimate" relations with Red China.

Of course, the pro-Red China lobby had been actively campaigning for years for just such an "opening". Its academicians, in large part based at Harvard, were especially eager to embrace Mao. In fact, a group of such professors from Harvard and MIT prepared a memorandum in the fall of 1968 outlining the steps to be taken to achieve "peace" with Communist China. The memorandum was addressed to "President-Elect Nixon", and it was delivered by -- have you guessed it? -- Henry A. Kissinger! The memorandum cast a long shadow of coming events:

. . . Suggesting you [Nixon] should seriously explore the possibility of arranging confidential, perhaps even deniable, conversations between Chinese Communist leaders and someone in whom you have confidence. It may be that the Chinese will refuse to receive such an emissary. The effort should nonetheless be made to signal a revised American attitude.

Bring China, both Vietnams and other divided nations into the United Nations. Seed an early opportunity to modify America's trade embargo against China.

And, certainly it is significant that shortly before the Kissinger-Nixon Administration began courting Red China like a love-starved Casanova, David Rockefeller held a press conference in Hong Kong and called for opening up trade with Communist China. Later, Mao and company would appoint the Rockefellers' Chase Manhattan Bank as Red China's official representative for Chinese-American trade.

In brief, all the signs point not to a Nixon initiative to China, but to a Nixon *response* to an initiative already planned and prepared by the Shadow Government, and implemented by the Insiders' number one agent in the White House, Henry A. Kissinger.

Asians in particular have made much of the fact that in all of the hullabaloo over an opening to Peking, not a single signal was flashed from China seeking such a new relationship. Not a single major Red Chinese dignitary came kowtowing to Washington, to genuflect at the feet of American power brokers. It was all the other way around. In the game of "face", the Chinese Communists won every round.

The fact is that a carefully orchestrated propaganda drive to build up Peking and downgrade Taiwan was already well underway. The publicity blitz would be underscored by lavish receptions for Presidents Nixon and Ford in the Great Hall of the People, elaborately staged tableaux of presidential families visiting cheerful communes, and banquet tables piled high with Chinese cuisine.

By now, rehabilitation of the "Old China Hands" -- men like John Stewart Service, John Paton Davies, John Carter Vincent, Oliver Edmund Clubb, and other pro-Communist policy molders of the World War II era who had done so much for Mao Tse-tung, Ho Chi-minh, and Chou En-lai -- was almost complete. The Peking butchers were henceforth to be regarded as moderate, responsible leaders of a nation which no longer could be considered as an aggressor.

Recent history regarding Korea and Vietnam and other unpleasant facts, such as the brutal invasion and annexation of Tibet, were conveniently dumped into the Orwellian memory hole. Washington went all-out to create an image of a changing China taking its place in the world community. The director, producer, and choreographer for the whole phony skit was of course Henry Kissinger.

Not everyone was buying the new scenario. A notable exception was FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, whose sudden death in the midst of the contrived euphoria over the embrace of Red China was convenient to say the least.

Kissinger's friendly biographer, Charles Ashman, relates the following:

"For a long time Kissinger kept out of the dispute over whether Hoover should be forcibly retired. . .

Then J. Edgar goofed -- and badly -- when Nixon was about to announce his projected trip to Red China. It was a venture dear to the heart of Kissinger, the theoretician and advance man. He had waited more than three years to reactivate the plan he had privately given Governor Nelson Rockefeller for reopening the door to China. . .

Hoover was not among the handful of top officials consulted when plans for the President's visit to China were brewing. . .

It was hardly surprising. . . that during a routine appearance before a Congressional committee, Hoover routinely warned the lawmakers, "the United States is Communist China's No. 1 enemy. The most potent threat to our national security is Red China." ZAP! Kissinger was furious."

Kissinger quietly arranged for the FBI Director's comments not to be published, for, he said, "budgetary" reasons. Sure. But the FBI Director released them to the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The result was a scathing article which warned that Red Chinese spies, under the guise of trade and cultural missions, would flood the nation. Hoover died in the spring of 1972, but, as Ashman puts it, "his days were probably numbered" by then anyway.

In the same year, the White House suppressed a documentary film made by the U.S. Information Agency (which can hardly be described as a right-wing anti-Communist group). The movie, "Man from a Missing Land", portrayed the Red Chinese takeover of Tibet, culminating in the flight of the Dalai Lama, Tibet's spiritual leader. The Dalai Lama said that the Red Chinese had broken every promise they had ever made regarding Tibetan autonomy.

But by this time, Kissinger was proclaiming that his new friends had always been "true to their word", so history had to be doctored to support him. The taxpayers never saw the film -- although they had paid nearly \$100,000 for it.

By 1975, Henry's determination to permit nothing to embarrass the Red Chinese had become an absolute phobia. Even Liberal columnist Jack Anderson reported:

Secretary of State Henry Kissinger is so sensitive over the special relationship he has nurtured with the Chinese Communists that he personally makes all decisions on Chinese matters, no matter how trivial they may be.

One of the trivial matters in which Kissinger took a direct hand was his effort to play down the Republic of China's participation in the American Bicentennial. The Kissinger order, reported Anderson, was "to keep the Nationalists {Taiwan} as invisible as possible".

In 1971 Kissinger had declared:

"Our position is that the ultimate disposition, the ultimate relationship of Taiwan to the People's Republic of China, should be settled by direct negotiations between Taiwan and the People's Republic of China".

Please notice that the Republic of China -- a free and independent nation -- had become Taiwan, the name of the island, and, historically, just one province of the mainland. The demotion was a diplomatic rebuff clearly signaled to the rest of the world.

Almost at once, there were leaks from Washington to the effect that the Red Chinese would not agree to the first Nixon trip until they received advance guarantees that the United States would reduce its military presence in the Republic of China. Although such a "deal" was denied at the time -- after all, who in Washington could admit that the United States had grovelled to meet Red China's terms? -- even President Ford now admits that American military assistance to Free China is being drastically reduced.

The shape of things to come was indicated in the so-called "Shanghai Communique", issued during the Nixon trip of 1972. The communique stated that the United States recognizes that Taiwan is a part of China and "affirms the ultimate objective of the withdrawal of all U.S. forces and military installations from Taiwan".

And remember that the island republic that was being so completely betrayed was not only of our staunchest anti-Communist allies; our leaders were also helping subvert a nation which had achieved an economic miracle since World War II. As Representative Philip M. Crane told his colleagues in the House of Representatives on December 11, 1975:

"A recent survey of family life in Taipei, the capital city, suggests a standard of living unknown on the Communist Chinese mainland and in most parts of Asia. More than half the families live in their own homes, most of the rest live in apartments and only a handful live in government provided housing. . .

What makes these accomplishments most remarkable is the fact that the Republic of China has the highest population density in the world."

While it is true that much of this was accomplished, or at least started, with the assistance of U.S. foreign aid, it is also true that Free China is one of the few nations on earth that has *repaid* the loans and grants it received from this country. This is reported about as often as the fact that the Soviet Union still owes us over \$11 billion from World War II.

When the lengthening shadow of Watergate finally forced his resignation, President Nixon made much of the fact that during his truncated tenure he had "unlocked the doors" between the United States and China.

But Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, widow of the fabled leader whom the Americans had abandoned, put things in a better perspective. "The unlocking of the doors of the mainland would indeed be a very good thing were it true", she said. "Unlocking the doors means free egress and ingress. The pity of it all is that no compatriots of ours are permitted to leave the country and their enforced serfdom."

In 1975, after a visit to Peking by President Gerald Ford, Kissinger could strongly hint that the next steps in re-establishing diplomatic relations with Peking would be for the United States to sever diplomatic ties with nationalist China and substantially reduce troop levels on Taiwan.

Henry Bradsher put it just that directly in the Washington Star:

A blunt fact that was long obscured in circumlocutions and pious intentions has finally emerged into the open as a result of President Ford's trip to China: The United States will simply have to break its written and moral commitments to the Chinese Nationalist regime and cast Taiwan adrift if it intends to have full-scale, normalized relations with the People's Republic of China.

Two years earlier, Kissinger was confident enough of his position -- and the plans of his superiors -- to assure his Red Chinese friends that U.S. friendship with the mainland would continue "whatever the Administration" in Washington. After all, administrations come and go, but the Rockefellers endure.

In 1973 Kissinger met for almost three hours with the ailing Mao Tse-tung. As usual, whatever was discussed in the session, and whatever agreements were made, remained cloaked in secrecy. But Peking officials said the talks "looked far into the future" and were of "great significance".

Kissinger's 1975 preparatory trip was followed by what must have been the most anti-climactic visit in the entire series of American arrivals in the fabled Heavenly Kingdom. So little was accomplished when Gerald Ford and entourage arrived in Peking, in fact, that there was not even a joint communique issued at the end of the mission. The visit seemed even more unnecessary than the ones undertaken before.

Oh sure, there were the usual sumptuous state banquets, there was lots of clapping in unison by Red chinese moppets, theatrical and gymnastic performances, visits to Chinese shrines, and Betty Ford even performed with a dance troupe. But there was so little real news that White House press Secretary Ron Nessen scampered around, cautioning reporters not to assume that because nothing was happening, nothing was being accomplished.

Part of the problem, of course, may have been that the Red chinese hierarchy had only a passing interest in the interim American President -- a man whom they may already have decided was only a figurehead anyway.

Associated Press reported that Mao gave his biggest welcome to Kissinger, not Ford. The Chinese leader noticeably and vigorously pumped the beaming Kissinger's hand for at least half a minute when the Americans arrived. Later, when he said goodbye, Mao again shook Kissinger's hand longer than Ford's. Such apparently minor matters may be ignored by most Americans, but you can be sure that foreign leaders -- especially in the Orient -- know exactly what such demonstrations mean. And so does Herr Kissinger!

so what, really, does it all mean? It is obvious that Kissinger has forgotten his 1961 assessment that "China is lost to the cause of freedom" and that "everywhere Communism presses aggressively on its peripheries". (Or at least he would like others to forget those remarks.)

What has happened? Did the men he described in 1961 as "callous fanatics" change? Or did he?

Certainly, the American people have a right to know just what is being gained by the Red China gambit. We have been told it is essential to world peace, that it represents a thawing in dangerous relations. We have been told it is good for business -- ignoring the fact that the small island of Taiwan out-exports the primitive and backward mainland economy by a ration of a thousand to one.

Finally, we are told that we simply can't afford not to strive for better relations with leaders who rule somewhere between 700 and 800 million human beings. While the same pundits and policy makers who tell us we must open the doors to Red China also insist we quarantine Rhodesia as a threat to world peace. What hypocrisy!

While Red china has been conducting a "smiling-face diplomacy" that is quite comfortable with Henry Kissinger's own vision of a Grand Design which will see the slow merger of the United States into a world government, the Peking masters have also been actively preparing to reach for our throats.

In *The Necessity for Choice*, published in 1961, Herr Henry wondered worriedly "whether we can stand idly by while this peril (Chinese nuclear capacity) develops, simply trusting that a more humane group of leaders will replace the incumbents". Of course, no "more humane group" arose. but by 1972, Kissinger was trusting the incumbents *not* to mount a nuclear attack which the United States, thanks to his own policies, would be all but powerless to prevent.

While Henry Kissinger publicly pooh-poohs any military threat from Red China, the Communists there have been mounting a nuclear arsenal and also developing what is already the third largest navy in the world. According to the Institute for Strategic Studies in London, the Red Chinese already deploy more than a thousand vessels, including 60 submarines and 600 aircraft, and more are being built all the time.

By 1975 Red China had exploded 16 nuclear bombs ranging in strength from twenty kilotons to three megatons. At a secluded test range in occupied Tibet, the Chinese have been preparing for the launching of their first intercontinental ballistic missile. Events have strongly indicated that while the Peking hierarchy was "vigorously pumping" the hand of Henry Kissinger, and providing our Presidents with heaping plates of chow mein, the country has been engaged in a crash program to increase the quality and quantity of their offensive weapons.

Authors Phyllis Schlafly and Chester Ward (in *Kissinger on the Couch*) accuse the Secretary of State of knowingly misleading Congress regarding Red Chinese nuclear capabilities.

During a SALT 1 briefing, for example, Kissinger said, "our estimate of the Chinese nuclear capability is still approximately what it was at the time that Safeguard was developed -- implying that in the years 1969 to 1972, the Red Chinese were at a stand-still in nuclear weapons development. But back in February 1970, Defense Secretary Melvin Laird acknowledged that the Chinese were already able to test an intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM). And he added that he expected them to have an ICBM operational capacity "in the next several years".

By February 17, 1972, Laird was reporting:

The growth of Chinese nuclear strike capability has been remarkable given the short time it has been in existence and the formidable obstacles that had to be overcome. . .

There is some evidence that the Chinese are engaged in the *deployment* of solid fuel missiles. . .

The two Chinese space satellites launched during the last year and a half, the approximately one dozen nuclear tests since 1964, indicate a fairly high degree of sophistication in both missile and warhead development.

One year later, the Defense secretary remarked about the even more "remarkable growth of China's nuclear strike capability in both missiles and bombers". Laird said that "The (Communist). . . Chinese are moving forward rapidly with their program to *deploy* liquid-fueled missiles and to develop an ICBM".

If this is what Kissinger means by a standstill, we would hate to see how dangerous the Chinese Reds could become if they really tried!

Nuclear bombs and intercontinental missiles are a *potential* threat against us. There is an even more insidious weapon already in use. Lurking behind the smiling diplomacy of the Red Chinese is one of the most vicious weapons ever devised for global conquest -- the deliberate pushing of opium, heroin, and other narcotics in the Free World.

As early as 1960, Harry J. Anslinger, Chief of the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics, warned that more than five million acres of land in Red China were devoted exclusively to the intensive cultivation of the opium poppy. In fact, Anslinger reported, the production of opium was an organized government monopoly in Red China.

Red Chinese opium production has been variously estimated at 10,000 to 32,000 tons per year. Opium and its derivatives are thus the *single most important item* for the Red Chinese, who net an estimated \$5 *billion* a year from the diabolical business. The use of narcotics as a weapon of warfare by the Red Chinese was thoroughly documented in Vietnam, where heroin was offered to American servicemen at a fraction of its value. Now, the conquest of most of Southeast Asia by the Communists adds a whole new dimension to an already catastrophic situation.

For generations, much illicit opium has come from the "Golden Triangle" of Burma, Laos, and Thailand, where whole provinces have been involved in poppy cultivation. The Communist coup in Laos, and the possible absorption of Thailand, will provide massive new quantities of opium and derivatives to be pushed in the West.

the thirteen and fourteen-year-old girls in New York city who turn to prostitution to finance their addiction, the muggers and purse snatchers and burglars in Chicago and Dallas and a thousand other cities with expensive habits, the promising students who have turned off forever, these too are part of the price we in the West are paying for Henry Kissinger's "smiling-face diplomacy" with the Red Chinese.

**There may, of course, be an even more sinister reason for the Red China gambit. It is the reason which underlies so much of the frenetic surface activity of the Shadow Government: control of the world's energy resources.**

In April 1971, an elite group of international financiers, economists, and intellectuals called the Bilderbergers met in secret session at Woodstock, Vermont. Among the items discussed by the participants (who included Henry Kissinger, David Rockefeller, and various oil company officials) was "the possibility of a change in the American role in the world and its consequences".

As Congressman John Rarick reported in July 1971:

"Also early in April, reports were leaked concerning rich oil discoveries in the Asian Pacific area, including areas claimed by Red China. Mentioned among the oil exploration companies were those represented at the hush-hush Bilderberger meeting. Then in June, we were advised that Chase Manhattan Bank was ready to invest \$6 million in oil exploration and predicted \$250 billion in Free World investment in the Asian Pacific area up to 1980."

Later in the year, newspapers reported that a "fantastic exploration race" was underway in the Far East.

"Within the year, that dramatic change in American foreign policy had occurred. Within two years, the Los Angeles Times could report (on February 21, 1973): "Intensive surveys have indicated that oil fields that could almost equal all the rest of the world's known reserves almost certainly lie off China's shores. . .

The Chinese have been making inquiries of U.S. firms about the oil industry in general and deepwater drilling rigs in particular."

Since only the United States possesses the technology to drill for oil in the 400 to 600-foot depths involved, the discoveries made *detente* virtually inevitable. The pattern is clear: The international oil cartel, dominated by Rockefeller interests, has, perhaps, the *most* to gain from Washington-Peking *detente*. All other concerns -- ideological, strategic, geopolitical -- are subservient to that reality. And Henry Kissinger is, first and foremost, a loyal servant of the House of Rockefeller.

## Chapter Six

### EXCERPTS:

The second part of our secret pledge to Israel was the promise that we would provide the country with petroleum should it be boycotted by other oil producers!

The total cost of the deal boggles the imagination. Senator Jesse Helms called the pact a "blank check agreement" and warned that the final cost would not be known. Senator Harry F. Byrd stormed that the price tag, during the five years of its implementation, might be as high as \$15 billion. Other observers set the true cost at \$25 billion. Not a few Congressmen were aghast that, at a time when our citizens were being told that a full supply of oil could not be guaranteed in our own country, American taxpayers were being asked to guarantee oil supplies for Israel.

-----

. . . an even more mysterious occurrence: The worldwide alert of U.S. strategic and conventional forces on the night of October 24, 1973. Nixon and Kissinger said at the time that the United States was in the midst of its "most difficult" crisis since the Cuban missile episode of 1962. But neither man, despite promises to the contrary, has ever revealed what the crisis was! The U.S. and the U.S.S.R. were, presumably, nose-to-nose and eyeball-to-eyeball -- a whisker away from Armageddon. And no one knew why.

Of the various explanations that have been advanced, one that we may now firmly rule out of consideration is one that seemed to make the most sense -- and is the most charitable to Secretary Kissinger. It is that those sneaky, deceitful Russians were up to some diabolical stunt, the details of which can't be released, and Herr Henry stopped them cold in their tracks.

We now know this isn't what happened, because the United States and the Soviet Union were both represented by the same man in the Middle East -- Henry A. Kissinger!

## THE UNQUIET PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

If there is one ever-recurring image that made Henry Kissinger, it is that of an inspired flight-bag diplomat shuttling hurriedly between the capitals of the Middle East in the quest of an elusive peace.

No one can deposit the intermittent Arab-Israeli war at Kissinger's doorstep. It goes back too far for that. suffice it to say that American foreign policy in the Middle East was destined to get the United States into hot water from the beginning. By supporting the artificial creation of the state of Israel in the midst of the Arab world, this nation {the U.S.} alienated hundreds of millions of potential allies. From the Arab point of view, America's massive support of Israel since 1948 has been a hostile action for three decades.

This assessment has nothing to do with the noteworthy achievements of the Jewish state. It is obvious that Arab opposition to Israel, and Israel's determination to survive, constitute the unstoppable force colliding with the inexorable object. Nobody in his right mind believes the "peace" -- actually an "interim peace agreement" -- engineered by Henry Kissinger can endure for very long.

The 1975 Israeli-Arab accords negotiated by Kissinger did avoid an immediate confrontation between



the super-powers. But what they may very well have done is prepare the way for a much greater war -- one in which the United States will have, as usual, equipped *both* sides with sophisticated weapons.

The cost to the United States for the secret agreements secretly arrived at has been estimated at \$10 to \$25 billion, which is hardly cheery news to the U.S. taxpayers who will have to foot the bill. Nor did the interim agreement delight the Israelis, who were literally arm-twisted into accepting it.

Indeed, an Israeli journalist named Matti Golan claims that Israeli leaders feel they were repeatedly deceived by the U.S. Secretary of State. In *The Secret Conversations of Henry Kissinger*, Golan portrays Kissinger as an inveterate gossip who delights in malicious stories about the leaders with whom he negotiates. "He seems to have a need to prove to the world -- and to himself -- how great he is", Golan writes. "And that's another reason why he talks so much."

Golan charges that Kissinger:

- Blamed the Pentagon for holding up the airlift of arms to Israel, when he himself was responsible for the delay;
- Told Israel he would not negotiate a cease-fire with the Soviet Union, and then proceeded to do so;
- Encouraged Israel to score a decisive, last-minute military victory over the Arabs, then garnered more headlines by a grandstand demand for a halt in hostilities.

According to Golan, Israeli Premier Golda Meir was "shocked and furious" at Kissinger after the Secretary promised to delay talks in Moscow concerning the Middle East ceasefire (so Israel could recover from its serious set-backs in the war), then suddenly signed a cease-fire agreement with the Soviets.

The 1973 war, which was as striking a defeat for Israel as the Six-Day War in 1967 had been an amazing victory, may also have provided a smoke screen for something of more moment than the actual hostilities: namely, the rise in oil prices by the international petroleum cartel.

The prestigious International Institute for Strategic Studies in London has described the use of the "oil weapon" by the Arabs in the fall of 1973 as "the greatest shock, the most potent sense of a new era, of any event in recent years." The Arab boycott of the Western world, and the huge increase in oil prices which resulted, caused such economic and political repercussions that 1974 became known as "the year Europe lost its head" --a reference to the number of European rulers who were replaced in the ensuing panic.

Several commentators suggest that it was *detente*, arranged by Henry Kissinger, which gave the Arabs confidence to use the "oil weapon." Prior to *detente*, no one questioned the credibility of the U.S. nuclear umbrella or our determination to protect the nations of the Free World.

In the post-Vietnam world of *detente*, however, our reputation was on the skids. The militarily weak Arabs obviously placed their faith in the ability of the Soviets to block any Western retaliation for the oil boycott.

The new economic realities pummeled the dollar and European currencies furiously. The only beneficiaries of the oil crisis turned out to be the Arabs, the Soviet Union, and -- lest we forget -- the Western oil cartel. (It is the Western oil cartel, dominated by Rockefeller interests, which refines, distributes, and retails Arab oil.) As a result of the crisis, the Soviets were able to reap huge windfall profits from the value of their own gold reserves and from favorable exchange rates in deals with the West.

But the whole crisis also brought a bonanza to the oil barons in the West. So much so that some suspicious critics believe the Rockefeller-Kissinger team "put in the fix" at the beginning. The game plan, as these cynics see it, goes like this: the Arabs were encouraged to go to war to recover the territories they lost in 1967; in the meantime, the U.S. provided massive support to Israel, which in turn induced the Arabs to cut off supplies of oil to the West. This permitted U.S. oil companies to increase domestic prices a few cents a gallon *every week*; meanwhile, oil-producing nations doubled and tripled crude oil prices. The American oil firms with interest in both camps -- that is, those companies that are part of the Rockefeller-CFR team -- made a bundle.

Whether that exact sequence of events occurred because it was planned that way is still speculation. But the Arab oil embargo did provide a windfall for the Western petroleum cartel, shooting the Rockefeller-controlled Exxon into number one in *Fortune's* list of the nations' largest industrials. And there can be no doubt that the alarmist cries of a great petroleum scarcity were completely contrived.

At the time of the "crisis" of 1973-74, the Interior Department estimated the amount of "easily recoverable" oil at 80 billion barrels, and shale oil accessible through intensive technology at 600 billion barrels -- or enough to last 100 years at present consumption rates. This is in addition to the estimated 780 billion barrels available in offshore oil reserves. Nor does it include at least 20 billion barrels of oil easily accessible in Alaska. The sum total of these reserves, including the easily recoverable shale oil, is 880 billion barrels -- enough to last well in the 21st century!

In the meantime, the squeeze is on the consuming public and the small independent oil companies, not the giant multinational conglomerates. Back in 1969, the independents had urged President Nixon to lift oil import quotas, which would have allowed the importation of lower-priced foreign oil while easing the drain on domestic reserves.

But Nixon kept the import restrictions in place until just before the convenient 1973 Middle East war, thus guaranteeing a much higher price for foreign crude oil. The price tag for consumers in this country? Between \$4 and \$7 *billion* a year in higher prices.

Even by mid-December 1973, there was no genuine shortage at the gasoline pumps. Then along came William E Simon of the CFR. The nation's new federal energy czar, who had been an investment banker with Salomon Brothers (an international banking house linked to the Rockefellers), established an intriguing program whereby gasoline was allocated away from areas of high demand into areas where the demand was less.

Very quickly a panic began to develop. Who could tell people who had just spent hours waiting at the pump for their gasoline rations that there was no real shortage of petroleum?

Despite the overwhelming evidence that we were *not* "running out of oil", the petroleum panic of 1973 set the stage for Kissinger's next move -- promotion of a "global energy strategy". Another contrived panic was leading inevitably to its contrived solution -- more power and controls for the Insiders who were running the show.

For a more complete account of how shortages are deliberately created, especially in food and fuel, to drive up prices and prepare the way for more national (and later, international) controls, see Chapters Ten and Eleven of *The Rockefeller File*.

About this time, the public relations boys were called in to sell the public on the merits of Project Independence. But in a moment of candor, Secretary Kissinger admitted that talk of national "energy independence" is a fraud. Project Independence, he said, is simply "a way station on the way to Project Interdependence".

Another way station on the road to interdependence -- or, as Kissinger prefers to call it, a New World Order -- may be the flow of Western dollars to oil producers in the Middle East. The present flood of \$100 billion a year is greater than the total of all U.S. investments abroad. If the rate continues much longer, the Middle East oil producers may accumulate so much capital they will be able to "buy out" the West. Already their deposits in 21 of the largest U.S. banks have reached the astronomical total of \$14.5 billion.

In March 1975, *Harper's* published a curious article called "Seizing Arab Oil", written by someone (the pseudonym Miles Ignotus was used), "close to the Pentagon and to the highest level of U.S. policy-makers". The magazine presented a complete scenario of how the United States might use military action in the Arab countries to secure "vital" supplies of oil.

About the same time, you will recall, Kissinger had already spoken openly about possible U.S. military intervention in the Middle East, to protect our "vital" supplies of oil. His remarks, although totally out of place for a diplomat, did underscore our alleged dependence on Arab oil -- even though the Middle East supplies less than ten percent of all petroleum consumed in the United States.

In the meantime, the effect of Kissinger's action has been to protect the Arabs' position and profits! The *Los Angeles Times* commented in March 1975 that it was "indeed strange" to see the Ford Administration arranging "what would amount to a price support program for Arab oil -- a safety net that would protect the cartel from market forces that might otherwise destroy it".

As the *Times* observed, when the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries quadrupled the price of oil, it acted "like a 300% sales tax", draining away billions of dollars that otherwise would have been spent in the United States, therefore deepening the recession in the U.S. and Western Europe. "A major drop in oil prices", the *Times* analysis continued, would "contribute enormously to a return to prosperity by putting billions of dollars back into consumer pockets. It is amazing that... an Administration policy that would shut off the possibility of this happening has aroused so few questions".

It is amazing -- unless, of course, the real objective was *not* to rescue the West from a contrived shortage, but to strengthen the oil cartel, weaken national governments, grease the tracks for yet another slide toward interdependence -- meaning global government, meaning global monopoly.

Are the Arab sheiks being set up to trigger a war in the Middle East, a bloody conflict whose final outcome would be a major step toward world government and the "internationalization" of oil? And could the United States be drawn into such a conflict? Quite possible. The "interim peace agreement" constructed by Kissinger supports both possibilities.

Aside from the geographical concessions involved in the agreement (Israel withdrew to a new line in the Sinai, withdrew from the Giddi and Mitla passes, surrendered the Abu Rodeis oil fields on the Gulf of Suez, and gave up another corridor north of the fields), American guarantees to Israel include at least \$2 billion for military hardware during the current year, plus another \$350 million per year for five years as a "fuel replacement guarantee".

All of this will be underwritten by U.S. taxpayers, of course. Egypt already the recipient of gobs of American largess, did not fare quite as well, receiving promises of only \$750 million in aid. To sweeten the deal, the United States also threw in a \$2 million helicopter for Egyptian President Anwar Sadat (which no one in Egypt was trained to fly), and the promise of some \$16.5 million worth of wheat under a long-term low-interest loan.

When the terms of the deal were first announced, it was understood that the package also contained some secret commitment negotiated by Kissinger. Over the Secretary's strong objections, the Senate

Foreign Relations Committee voted to release all of the agreement. The terms turned out to be even worse than the parts already leaked to the press.

Among such routine matters as a U.S. pledge not to recognize the Palestine Liberation Organization and American assurances to continue providing Egypt with economic aid were two shockers.

First, the United States promised to consider supplying Israel with Pershing ground-to-ground missiles. The 460-mile-range Pershing missiles would put key Arab population centers within Israeli reach. And although the agreement calls for us to provide only conventional warheads, if reports are correct that Israel already has at least a dozen atomic bombs, there is no reason *not* to think Israel could equip the projectiles with nuclear warheads. Such a development could lead to an arms race in the Middle East that would make the early challenges seem as mild by comparison as a Saturday afternoon game of marbles.

The second part of our secret pledge to Israel was the promise that we would provide the country with petroleum should it be boycotted by other oil producers!

The total cost of the deal boggles the imagination. Senator Jesse Helms called the pact a "blank check agreement" and warned that the final cost would not be known. Senator Harry F. Byrd stormed that the price tag, during the five years of its implementation, might be as high as \$15 billion. Other observers set the true cost at \$25 billion. Not a few Congressmen were aghast that, at a time when our citizens were being told that a full supply of oil could not be guaranteed in our own country, American taxpayers were being asked to guarantee oil supplies for Israel.

There have been almost as many explanations offered for the incredibly generous American promises as there have been critics of the interim agreement itself.

Ernest Cuneo of the North American Newspaper Alliance, who described the Israeli-Egyptian accord as "a Munich with Hitlerian terms dictated by Henry Kissinger", has suggested that Super K may have been trapped into making such mind-boggling pledges when he was betrayed by his Russian friends. Cuneo reports the following scenario:

When the Russian general staff saw that the Israelis had surrounded the Egyptian Third Army, it loudly threatened military intervention and moved the Red Air Force into battle alert. Succumbing to the bluff, Kissinger ordered a cease-fire, which saved the Egyptian armies and forced the Israelis to yield the east bank of the Suez Canal.

Even the brothers Kalb, hardly hostile biographers of our super Secretary, don't seem to know what to make of Henry's negotiating prowess on this one. In their adulatory study *Kissinger*, Marvin and Bernard suggest that Kissinger was caught off-guard when the Soviet-subsidized Arabs attacked Israel. Henry had been convinced, the Kalbs state, that detente was working and that Soviet intransigence was melting. "Just as he had misjudged prewar intelligence", they wrote, "so too had he misjudged the will and capability of the Arabs and the duplicity of the Russians".

Possibly. But neither theory explains an even more mysterious occurrence: The worldwide alert of U.S. strategic and conventional forces on the night of October 24, 1973. Nixon and Kissinger said at the time that the United States was in the midst of its "most difficult" crisis since the Cuban missile episode of 1962. But neither man, despite promises to the contrary, has ever revealed what the crisis was! The U.S. and the U.S.S.R. were, presumably, nose-to-nose and eyeball-to-eyeball -- a whisker away from Armageddon. And no one knew why.

In *Kissinger on the Couch*, the authors suggest that the strategic alert might have been a Kissinger ploy

to sell the nation a dual message. First, that Kissinger somehow had stared down the Russians in a crisis and, second, that our strategic forces were still sufficiently frightening to fend off a Soviet attack. Such doomsday imagery was used at the SALT talks in Moscow and helped obscure the fact that the negotiations covertly but decisively favored the Soviet Union.

Of the various explanations that have been advanced, one that we may now firmly rule out of consideration is one that seemed to make the most sense -- and is the most charitable to Secretary Kissinger. It is that those sneaky, deceitful Russians were up to some diabolical stunt, the details of which can't be released, and Herr Henry stopped them cold in their tracks.

We now know this isn't what happened, because the United States and the Soviet Union were both represented by the same man in the Middle East -- Henry A. Kissinger!

Yes, so confident was Moscow of Kissinger's flight bag diplomacy in the crisis that he was used as a negotiator for both sides! That was the surprise disclosure by Soviet ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin, Kissinger's friend, who told other diplomats in Washington that Kissinger was serving as negotiator for the Soviets as well as the United States in the Middle East.

But if the worldwide "precautionary alert" by American forces was not meant to call the Soviets' bluff, for whom was it arranged? Perhaps to hide the fact that the Soviets and our Secretary of State were working hand-in-glove all along!

Impossible? But why not? The net result of the latest *pax Kissingeriae* will cost Americans anywhere from \$10 to \$25 billion. It will cost the Soviets not one red cent. Or should we say, not one Red ruble.

We have agreed to provide Israel with the latest advanced weaponry. At the same time we will give massive economic aid to Egypt and other Arab countries, guarantee the sheiks' oil profits, and thus enable the Arab bloc to go shopping for weapons to counter the new Israeli gadgets.

The result, then, of Kissinger's shuttle diplomacy in the Middle East was a "peace" package which guarantees peace for neither Israel nor her neighbors.

It shackles United States taxpayers with an incredible new burden. And its only clear beneficiaries are the Soviet Union, the oil cartel, and the promoters of a New World Order.

Once again the question arises: Who is Kissinger really serving?

Anyone who still contends that he is a sincere servant of the American people must also admit that he is then a miserable failure. His every act, every new accord he arranges, seems to help our enemies and hurt ourselves and our friends.

Reviewing the whole incredible picture, we can't quell the still small voice that keeps insisting, "It was all planned this way in the first place". Was it?

## Chapter Seven

### EXCERPTS:

In fact, Henry the K had even asked the Rand Corporation to study the circumstances under which the anti-Communist government of Brazil might be overthrown! This second study was not triggered by a great Kissinger concern over Brazil shifting to the Left. It seems that some Brazilian government

officials had discussed the possibility of expropriating the holdings of International Petroleum Company, a subsidiary of the Rockefellers' Standard Oil of New Jersey.

-----

So in August 1975, the Organization of American States, meeting in Costa Rica, voted 16 to 3 with two abstentions to lift its sanctions against the Communist dictatorship ninety miles from our shores. The U.S. Ambassador to the OAS, Rockefeller man William S. Maillard, did not make even a token resistance to this carefully staged repudiation of Washington's policy for the past eleven years.

Incredibly, the vote whitewashing Cuba did not set any conditions or make any demands of the Red dictatorship. The United States delegates did not even mention the 2,000 Americans still confined on the island, the \$2 *billion* indebtedness to Americans for property confiscated by Cuban authorities, the thousands of political prisoners languishing in Cuban dungeons, the 33,000 Cubans slain by the Communists to establish a Soviet power base on the island. All this was to be forgiven, forgotten, and ignored.

## BETRAYING FREEDOM IN LATIN AMERICA

The Nixon campaign rhetoric in 1968 promised a hard line against Communist excursions in the Western Hemisphere. But as in so many cases in the Nixon Era, while the conservatives got the rhetoric, the Liberals got all of the action. When Rockefeller agent Henry Kissinger was installed as adviser on national affairs, it became apparent that "holding firm" meant giving the Communists almost everything they wanted, just as quickly as public opinion would allow.

The Rockefeller-Kissinger team immediately began promoting a Latin American foreign policy which was the very antithesis of the policy Americans thought they were getting when they elected Richard Nixon. It consisted of two main reversals of earlier promises. The first was a growing recognition of the Communist conquest of Cuba. Accepting this fact was to be sold to the American people as hemispherically inevitable, necessary for peace, and besides, it made good business sense.

The second key part of the Kissinger policy was even more ticklish, and it ran into stiff opposition from the start. That was Henry the K's repeated efforts to surrender U.S. sovereignty over the Panama Canal. The giveaway of this strategic waterway was being sold to the public as vital to improve our poor relations with much of Latin America.

But most Americans were too mesmerized by the three-ring foreign-policy circus overseas -- the "opening" to Red China, the "peace" in Vietnam, the incessant war in the Middle East -- to pay too much attention to what was going on in nearby Latin America.

soon after Nixon took office in 1969, conservative columnist Paul Scott reported that although "the President pledged to tighten the U.S. economic-political quarantine of Cuba if elected, Kissinger is working quietly within the Nixon Administration for just the opposite". It became known that Kissinger had asked the Rand Corporation to make a study on the feasibility of restoring political, economic, and cultural relations with Cuba.

In fact, Henry the K had even asked the Rand Corporation to study the circumstances under which the anti-Communist government of Brazil might be overthrown!

This second study was not triggered by a great Kissinger concern over Brazil shifting to the Left. It seems that some Brazilian government officials had discussed the possibility of expropriating the

holdings of International Petroleum Company, a subsidiary of the Rockefellers' Standard Oil of New Jersey.

While all this was going on, any efforts within the Nixon Administration to move against Communism in this hemisphere -- and there *were* anti-Communists around Nixon as well as within the State and the CIA -- were blocked by Kissinger.

The stage was set for U.S. trade with the Cuban tyranny and eventual U.S. recognition through one of Henry's usual tactics -- secret U.S. maneuvering. The plan called for the Organization of American States to soften its stand against Cuba. Then the United States would reluctantly bow to "the will of the Americas" and grant recognition to the Castro regime. The whole affair was about as spontaneous as the Rose Parade.

The North American Newspaper Alliance reported in October 1974 that an agreement "in principle" for U.S. recognition of Cuba had already been reached and that "the current script calls for the United States to appear as if it were forced to acquiesce to the views of the other American States".

NANA's Ernest Cuneo added: "In clinging to the ridiculous fiction that his State Department officials know nothing of the negotiations, Kissinger is moralizing to the American people -- again.

By May 1975 *The Review of the News* could report that

"through the covert efforts of Secretary of State Henry Kissinger governments of Latin American countries are being told that the U.S. looks with favor on the lifting of sanctions against Communist Cuba by the Organization of American States".

By June, Fidel Castro was so confident that the United States would restore diplomatic relations with Cuba that he predicted in Madrid's *Arriba* magazine, that recognition would occur, that Latin American countries would grow stronger while the United States grew weaker, and that Cuba was not planning to budge one inch on its declared aim of seizing our Guantanamo Naval base.

"Some day they will leave Guantanamo just as they left Vietnam in the war that cost them \$150 billion", the bearded one gloated.

Another part of Kissinger's propaganda effort on behalf of Castro was granting permission for "friendly" U.S. congressmen to junket to Cuba. The most enraptured visitor was former presidential candidate George McGovern, the muddled Leftist who made Richard Nixon look so good by comparison in 1972. McGovern's trip to Cuba resulted in a saccharin outpouring of eulogies for Castro and demands for an end to our economic embargo.

Kissinger, who arranged McGovern's private flight to Cuba from a U.S. airbase in Florida, got exactly what he wanted.

So in August 1975, the Organization of American States, meeting in Costa Rica, voted 16 to 3 with two abstentions to lift its sanctions against the Communist dictatorship ninety miles from our shores.

The U.S. Ambassador to the OAS, Rockefeller man William S. Maillard, did not make even a token resistance to this carefully staged repudiation of Washington's policy for the past eleven years.

Incredibly, the vote whitewashing Cuba did not set any conditions or make any demands of the Red dictatorship. The United States delegates did not even mention the 2,000 Americans still confined on the island, the \$2 *billion* indebtedness to Americans for property confiscated by Cuban authorities, the

thousands of political prisoners languishing in Cuban dungeons, the 33,000 Cubans slain by the Communists to establish a Soviet power base on the island. All this was to be forgiven, forgotten, and ignored.

While Kissinger is cuddling up to Cuba, the island has become virtually a Russian military outpost. There are at least 25,000 Russian soldiers operating military bases at Mariel, Nipe, Cienfuegos, Cayo Largo, Playa Giron, and the Isle of Pines. Some 8,000 Russian technicians run most of Cuba's vital industries. There are frequent Soviet spy flights and reconnaissance sailings from points within Cuba.

For the past seventeen years, Communist Cuba has also been exporting its revolution in every way that it can. Airplane hijackings, for example, increased some four-hundred percent in the late 1960s -- just after a school for hijackers was organized on the island. The evidence is indisputable that Havana has become a key base for the smuggling of opium and other hard narcotics from Communist supply sources in the Far East into the United States and Latin America.

Fidel Castro has openly gloated, of course, that he expects to take over the U.S. Naval Base on Guantanamo -- the multi-billion-dollar American outpost which is a vital link for American defense forces in the Western Hemisphere. Should Henry Kissinger present this giftwrapped to the Communists (and in Washington there are rumors such a secret deal has already been made), the Communists would threaten *all* shipping through the Panama Canal.

While Fidel's effort to supply the leadership to Communist revolts in other Latin and South American countries may have faltered in recent years, the presence of Cuban troops in Africa more than makes up for any failures closer to home. Any conceivable detente with Cuba became even harder to swallow in late 1975 and 1976 as it became clear that the Soviet Union was using Cuba as its major base for the armed takeover of Angola, the former Portuguese territory on Africa's west coast. The 15,000 Cuban troops inside Angola may well have made the difference for the Soviet victory in the war there.

According to Paul Scott, thousands of Cuban troops, military advisers, and espionage agents, financed and directed by the Russians, are deployed in at least fifteen countries on three continents. In the meantime, Cuba's 150,000-man army remains the largest in the Western Hemisphere, other than our own.

As the Angola involvement developed day by day in late 1973 and early 1976, Kissinger *sounded* good. He talked tough about the Cubans sending soldiers to Africa, about the Soviet Union being in Africa, about the "extra-continental intervention" into Angolan affairs.

But as expected, the Administration *did* nothing to thwart the Communists. In fact, since much of the \$81 million in the U.S. grants, loans, and credits for neighboring Zaire, run by the Marxist "President for Life" Sese Seko Kuku Ngbendu Wa Za Banga, were funneled into Angola, it meant the United States was in the unique position of helping Red China fund one of the "anti-Soviet" factions in the weird Angola war.

So while Kissinger publicly warned Castro about Cuban intervention in Angola, at the same time Henry K told the U.S. representative to the Organization of American States to vote for dismantling the OAS special commission which had kept tabs on Communist activities in the Western Hemisphere. Kissinger was about as sincere as W.C. Fields offering to lead a temperance crusade against demon rum.

Why is Henry Kissinger so determined to have the United States embrace Communist Cuba?

Part of the reason, no doubt, is the whole do-anything-to-please-the-Communists mentality which plays such an important part in *detente*. And there is ample evidence that the Soviets would like to see the American taxpayers underwrite the cost of the glorious socialist experiment on the island.



Although Cuba had been one of the wealthiest nations in the Americas before the advent of Communism, presently it is a \$1.5 million *per day* liability for Moscow. Much better that the burden be shifted to U.S. taxpayers.

In fact, the Union Defensora de la Democracia, an anti-Communist group in Mexico, reported in mid-1975 that the stage has already been set for the Rockefellers' Chase Manhattan Bank to loan Cuba all the money it needs to cut its \$8-million -per-week umbilical cord with Moscow. The loans, of course, will never be repaid; the money will be loaned by the Rockefellers, but *guaranteed by the U.S. government*.

When Castro defaults, the U.S. government will pay off the Rockefellers.

It would hardly be the first time that American taxpayers have rescued Rockefeller operations in other countries. A huge number of U.S. loans for "less developed countries" have a strange way of ending up in the pockets of the Rockefellers. Foreign aid programs, for example, apparently insure Rockefeller gaming lodges in Kenya, Rockefeller agricultural and marketing businesses in Iran, a Rockefeller ceramic tile and bath accessory plant in Korea, Rockefeller firms in the Dominican Republic, and House of Rockefeller enterprises in India, Guyana, Brazil, Pakistan, the Philippines, and dozens, perhaps scores, of other countries.

The *London Sunday Telegraph* on August 31, 1957 however, provided an even more intriguing explanation for the Rockefeller-Kissinger embrace of Castro:

This year's most surprising *detente* -- the resumption of relations of a sort between President Ford's U.S.A. and Fidel Castro's Communist Cuba -- owes a good deal more to hard heads than to soft hearts. The motive behind it can be summed up in one word -- oil. . .

Recent seismological tests by the Russians in Cuban waters have apparently revealed the likelihood of several large oil structures which form the immensely rich Gulf of Mexico oil fields. But Castro knows only too well that to develop such fields he will need American finance.

Kissinger's kiss-and-make-up approach to Communist Cuba (at U.S. taxpayer expense, of course) is bad enough for America. But actually his policies regarding Cuba seem like hard-nosed anti-Communism when compared to his incredible actions aimed at surrendering U.S. sovereignty over the Panama Canal.

If American sentiment and official congressional action count for anything, the chances that the federal government will give away the Panama Canal are zero. On June 24, 1975, the House of Representatives voted 246 to 164 to prohibit any State Department funds from being used to negotiate the surrender of any U.S. rights in the Panama Canal Zone.

Public surveys taken about the same time showed that five Americans out of six wanted the U.S. to retain ownership of the Canal. And a group of 38 Senators -- four more than needed to block ratification of any giveaway treaty -- was on record opposing any surrender of U.S. rights in the Canal Zone.

but popular sentiment and even Congressional action were not enough to thwart a Kissinger who had already chosen a different direction. Following the House vote, he sent the following message to General Omar Torrijos, the pro-Soviet dictator of Panama:

I want you to know that in spite of these things, I am still engaged in the search for a final and just solution to this problem and the establishment of a new and more modern relationship between the two countries.

In other words, Henry the K was apologizing to Comrade Torrijos because the representatives of the American people refused to go along with Kissinger's surrender scheme!

Despite the propaganda line being developed to "legitimize" the surrender of our sovereignty over the Panama Canal, the facts are as follows:

The Panama Canal belongs to the United States.

The Canal Zone was sold to this country on November 18, 1903, by the new Republic of Panama.

The agreement gave the United States total and complete ownership "in perpetuity".

The treaty was ironclad -- it stated that U.S. sovereignty would be "to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority."

Despite what some American negotiators, such as Ellsworth Bunker and William d. Rogers, have suggested, it seems absurd to think that the U.S. could be stampeded into signing away the Panama Canal because of sword-rattling by a tiny Latin American country. "If Panama does not recover the Canal Zone, no one can prevent the Panamanians from destroying, making inoperative, or paralyzing the canal", said one foreign policy adviser.

Panama "has reached the limit of its patience" in negotiations with the U.S. for a new treaty, warned Dictator Torrijos in early 1975. The United States has 11,000 troops stationed along the Canal -- twice the number of soldiers that Torrijos commands. But Bunker and Rogers act as if they were truly worried about what this tinhorn dictator might do.

Ellsworth Bunker, moreover, seems to have made a career out of surrendering gracefully to the Communists. He was the main negotiator of the team that turned over control of West New Guinea to Communist Achmed Sukarno in 1965, in exchange for a worthless promise of free elections.

Bunker later was appointed U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam, where he continually lectured American military officials on the need to exercise "the Patience and restraint to fight a limited war with limited means for limited objectives". Ellsworth Bunker is, in short, a giveaway artist and a capitulation expert. He is just the kind of fellow Kissinger would select for negotiations on giving away the Panama Canal.

Incredibly enough, Bunker has claimed that giving the Panama Canal to the Communists will somehow be good for us. "In our negotiations we are attempting to lay the foundations for anew -- a more modern -- relationship which will enlist Panamanian cooperation and *better protect our interest*", he has said.

That groaning sound you hear is Teddy Roosevelt turning over in his grave. Teddy Roosevelt, who maneuvered to get the canal built, later said,

"The canal must not be internationalized. It is our canal; we built it; we fortified it, and we will not permit our enemies to use it in war. In times of peace, all nations shall use it alike, but in time of war our interest becomes dominant."

The United States does not "rent" the Canal Zone. This country paid for and has clear title to it. Giving away the clear title we have to the Panama Canal is exactly the same as giving Alaska back to Russia, returning the Louisiana Purchase to France, or surrendering Texas and California to Mexico and Spain.

It will not surprise you to learn that an early architect of the Panama giveaway scheme was a Rockefeller man, Robert B. Anderson of the CFR. He was President Johnson's chief negotiator in 1967, subsequently kept on by Richard Nixon. (The *first* U.S. official to propose that the Canal be internationalized was the very respected CFR man in the State Department, Alger Hiss!)

But it was that other, much better known Rockefeller agent, Henry Kissinger, who took up the cudgels from Anderson. Herr Henry signed a "statement of principles" with Dictator Torrijos in February 1974, promising that the U.S. would renounce sovereignty over the Canal and hand it over to Panama. When Nixon resigned and Ford assumed what used to be the highest office in the land, Kissinger was quick to inform Panama that "the change in the U.S. presidency will not affect the negotiations for a new Panama Canal treaty".

Perhaps alarmed by the growing opposition within the United States to Kissinger's surrender schemes in the Caribbean, a new Rockefeller pressure group, "The Commission on U.S.-Latin American Relations" was launched in mid-1974 (a few months after Secretary Kissinger signed the 'statement of principles' with Panama's Marxist Dictator), to marshal public support for our planned retreat. The commission is financed by grants from -- would you believe?-- the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the Ford Foundation, the Clark Foundation, and David Rockefeller's Center for Inter-American Affairs.

The Commission promptly unveiled its own program for peace in Central America. The major plan, of course was a call for a new treaty with Panama in which the United States would cancel all claims to ownership of the Canal.

When this Rockefeller-Kissinger giveaway scheme encountered heavy opposition in 1975, not only from the public but also from Congress, the Rockefeller Commission came up with a new wrinkle to the basic surrender plan the Shadow Government had been following. The new scheme, which was designed to sidestep opposition from the Congress, called for the United States to continue to use the land and facilities in Panama, and pay for them, but to transfer jurisdiction to Panama.

Since the deal would not involve any sale or transfer of U.S. property, Congress would be left out of the negotiations -- and the U.S. would retain an empty title. This Rockefeller-designed gambit is probably behind Kissinger's convoluted explanation of our new policy regarding Panama:

The U.S. is seeking to establish a new and mutually acceptable relationship between our two countries whereby the U.S. can continue operating and defending the canal for a reasonably extended period of time. A new treaty would enable the U.S. to devote its energies to the efficient operation and control of the waterway and would leave other matters to the Panamanians.

Translate that to read: We'll arrange it so that Uncle Sam -- I mean, Sam -- will continue to pay all the bills. But we'll make sure that when the chips are down, it will be our Comrades in Panama -- and Moscow -- who will determine which ships pass through and which ones don't.

What would the loss of American jurisdiction over the Panama Canal mean? First would be the devastating diplomatic consequences of yet another collapse of American power and authority. But there is a far more serious aspect of Henry K's two-pronged campaign to legitimize Communism in Cuba and to surrender our sovereignty over the Panama Canal.

As we reported earlier, the Soviet Navy now surpasses the U.S. Navy. It virtually controls the Mediterranean and Indian Oceans, and through the Soviet conquests in Africa, is becoming dominant in the Atlantic. Should part of the price for Kissinger's detente mean the loss of both the Panama Canal and the U.S. base on Guantanamo, the stage would be set for the Communists to sever the connecting link

between the U.s. Pacific fleet and our Atlantic forces. In effect, Kissinger's planned retreat in the Caribbean would extend the Soviet spheres of naval dominance from the Black Sea across the Atlantic to our very shores. It would leave all of Latin and south America unprotected and indefensible.

As Representative Daniel Flood has stated:

"I do not see how the Kremlin itself could have prepared a more effective plan for causing confusion and chaos on the Isthmus than has been done by our treaty negotiators -- a plan that is designed to assure the ultimate extinction of all United States authority with respect to any canal on the Isthmus."

Or to put it another way, Moscow's most important man in Latin America is not Fidel Castro; it's Henry Kissinger.

## Chapter Eight

### EXCERPTS:

Kissinger's apologists have claimed that their hero inherited a war whose successful outcome eluded three prior administrations. But the record now is clear -- Super Kraut had been a key policy adviser on Vietnam since the Johnson years and always championed no-win policies.

Joseph Harsch (CFR) noted in 1968 that Kissinger "was one of the first among the top experts to conclude that a military victory in Vietnam was, perhaps, neither possible nor desired."

-----

Throughout the Vietnam War, the U.S. did little that was right -- right in the sense of trying to win the war. But during the Nixon years there were three actions taken which veteran military observers supported as moves in the proper direction:

- the invasion of Cambodia in 1970 to eliminate Communist sanctuaries;
- the May 1972 decision to mine Haiphong Harbor; and
- the December 1972 decision to bomb North Vietnam.

**Secretary of State Kissinger opposed all three measures.**

-----

In private talks in 1968, Henry said that the "appropriate goal" of U.S. policy in Vietnam should be to permit a "decent interval" -- say, two or three years -- between the withdrawal of U.S. forces and a complete Communist takeover of the country!

## THE SELLOUT OF SOUTHEAST ASIA

Perhaps the grimmest irony of the Kissinger years was the awarding of the Nobel Peace Prize to the Secretary of State in 1974, honoring his efforts to end the Vietnam War. The ceremonies in Stockholm were hardly over when the Communists seized three Southeast Asian countries. Herr Henry did not even

have time to spend the \$50,000 prize before South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia had been swallowed by the Communist juggernaut. Some peace!

North Vietnam's Le Duc Tho, with whom Kissinger shared the Peace Prize, declined the award -- no doubt aware that the Paris accords were but a way station on the road to a total Red victory.

The January 1973 "peace agreement" which Super K negotiated had in fact set up South Vietnam for the kill, by allowing the Communists to keep more than 150,000 Red troops "in place" in the South, while American military personnel were withdrawn. Anyone who was surprised at what happened would be equally disappointed when the tooth fairy fails to make an appearance. South Vietnam was overrun, Cambodia collapsed, and Laos became fully communist.

It was a three-bagger. the United States lost three former allies in as many months.

for the first time it became obvious to the world that American strength meant nothing in the face of a Communist advance.

The highly touted *Mayaguez* incident may have helped reverse the Administration's faltering image at home, but it did nothing to change the facts overseas. When Cambodian Communists seized the merchantman *Mayaguez* and its crew of 39 in May 1975, American warplanes blasted five Cambodian vessels out of the water, the Marines stormed Tang Island, and U.S. fighter-bombers blitzed an airbase and an oil depot on the mainland to secure the sailors' release.

The theatrical assault cost five American dead, 16 missing, and 70 to 80 wounded, but it was proof-positive that U.S. might can be used successfully when Washington wants to. It gave the sagging Ford Administration and defeat-weary Americans a lift in spirits, but it did not change the facts -- or the fate of South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos.

At least, these were the facts in 1971. In the fall of that year, a group of U.S. observers toured all 44 provinces of south Vietnam and noted that the Saigon government -- hardly an ideal administration -- had essential working control over the full country. The Vietcong insurgency had been smashed. But U.S. bombing pauses and strategic lulls were giving the North time to build up and regroup its forces in the south.

Then, in the spring of 1972, North Vietnam openly invaded the south. It was only after the invasion of tens of thousands of North Vietnamese troops that the Paris "peace" accords were arranged. The new reality confirmed by Henry Kissinger accepted the presence of more than 150,000 Red soldiers in South Vietnam -- with 50,000 more ready to join them.

Kissinger's apologists have claimed that their hero inherited a war whose successful outcome eluded three prior administrations. But the record now is clear -- Super Kraut had been a key policy adviser on Vietnam since the Johnson years and always championed no-win policies.

Joseph Harsch (CFR) noted in 1968 that Kissinger "was one of the first among the top experts to conclude that a military victory in Vietnam was, perhaps, neither possible nor desired."

It is also known that Kissinger established his own links with North Vietnam as early as 1967. His secret negotiations -- arranged by avowed Communists from Australia and France -- assured Moscow and Hanoi from the start that Herr Henry would not countenance any American moves that might lead to an anti-Communist victory.

Throughout the Vietnam War, the U.S. did little that was right -- right in the sense of trying to win the

war. But during the Nixon years there were three actions taken which veteran military observers supported as moves in the proper direction:

- the invasion of Cambodia in 1970 to eliminate Communist sanctuaries;
- the May 1972 decision to mine Haiphong Harbor; and
- the December 1972 decision to bomb North Vietnam.

Secretary of State Kissinger opposed all three measures.

The Americans found in Cambodia they were mostly chasing ghosts. Obviously forewarned, few Communist troops were encountered -- though some supplies and foodstuffs were found.

Reliable sources within the intelligence community report that Henry the K told his good friend Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin about plans for the invasion while the two attended a Soviet cocktail party to commemorate Lenin's 100th birthday.

Regarding the mining of Haiphong Harbor -- which was also an ineffectual but highly publicized gambit -- Jack Anderson reported in October 1974 that this was the single action Nixon ever took on his own, one in which he overrode all his close advisers, including his Vietnam expert, Henry Kissinger.

But it was the third incident; Nixon's decision on December 17, 1972 to bomb North Vietnam, which let to a real split between the two. Kissinger so angered the President, we have been told, that Nixon ordered Henry's phone tapped and finally decided that Kissinger should be replaced.

The story was first broken by one-time Nixon hatchet man Charles Colson in his book *Born Again*. Other sources confirmed the details:

Kissinger pleaded with Nixon to "explain his reasons for the bombing". When the President refused, and ordered the Executive Branch to maintain a strict silence about the bombing renewal, Kissinger let it be known that he opposed the bombing.

When *New York Times* columnist James Reston reported Kissinger's dissent, Nixon was furious. The President said:

"I will not tolerate insubordination. You tell Henry he's to talk to no one, period! I mean no one! And tell him not to call me. I will accept no calls from him."

Nixon sought solace in watching a Washington Redskins football game, while Henry jetted off to Palm Springs, California. Next, says Colson,

"The President ordered me to have the Secret Service keep a record of all incoming and outgoing calls from Kissinger's heavily guarded villa in Palm Springs."

Kissinger tried to telephone Nixon, but the President refused to talk with him. Kissinger then contacted another media friend, *Washington Post* columnist Joseph Kraft, who reported that Kissinger had valiantly opposed Nixon's bombing order. This infuriated Nixon so much that he "began counting the days until Henry left to return to Harvard", Colson continues.

Earlier this year, columnist Jack Anderson reported that Super K was well aware that an irate Nixon was moving to dump him as Secretary of State.

"Sources close to Kissinger say he was acutely aware of the move to send him back to Harvard. The H.R. Haldeman-John Ehrlichman-Charles Colson palace guard wanted to force him out in disgrace and make him the scapegoat for Nixon's bombing policies."

But as everyone knows, it was not Kissinger who left Washington in disgrace, but the President himself. We will take a look at Henry's behind-the-scenes role in Watergate, which led to this amazing turnabout, in Chapter Ten.

Even with the massive Communist buildup in 1971 and 1972, who can doubt the the United States could still have achieved victory in Vietnam had Nixon truly been committed to it? Of course he was not. But the point is, Kissinger had made it clear since 1967 that he believed the war could not be won.

In private talks in 1968, Henry said that the "appropriate goal" of U.S. policy in Vietnam should be to permit a "decent interval" -- say, two or three years -- between the withdrawal of U.S. forces and a complete Communist takeover of the country!

In Vietnam, as in Korea before, the United States managed to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory. We allowed (some say encouraged) the Communist buildup in the North. We did nothing to profit the massive invasion of the South, and then, in "peace talks" in Paris, we permitted North Vietnam to leave 150,000 fully equipped troops in south Vietnam. IT was a sufficient advantage to assure the Communists of their eventual victory. So why on earth would the South Vietnamese accept a treaty which virtually guaranteed the conquest of their country?

CBS newsmen Marvin and Bernard Kalb, in their book *Kissinger*, report that south Vietnamese President Nguyen van Thieu told Kissinger that the treaty was *not* acceptable. "To sign would be like surrendering to the Communists", they quote Thieu as protesting. "It would make a mockery of the thousands of Americans and Vietnamese who died here." But Thieu, whose spine was so weak it might have been transplanted from a jellyfish, finally cave in.

In the spring of 1975, Senator Henry M. Jackson and Admiral Elmo R. Zumwalt both claimed that Thieu agreed to accept the Paris accords only after President Nixon and Henry Kissinger promised him that the United States would "respond vigorously" to any Communist violations of the peace agreement.

Within thirty days of the signing, of course, Hanoi began moving massive amounts of troops and equipment into South Vietnam -- and no aid was forthcoming. But this cannot be blamed solely on Kissinger. Congress finally bowed to pressures against any further support for a cause that the American Left had long assured the nation was lost anyway.

The fact remains, however, that our allies counted on an American guarantee of aid and never got it. Thieu's stated belief that the U.S. sold South Vietnam to the Communists rings disturbingly true.

The important question now is not whether the war could have been won. It is, Why was the war needlessly prolonged? Whether viewed from the perspective of the ultra-hawks, who argued for complete victory, or the ultra-doves, who demanded an immediate American withdrawal, there was no conceivable reason to prolong the Vietnam War, needlessly but deliberately.

Yet, that is exactly what resulted from Herr Henry's strange policies for over six years -- from 1968 until 1973 -- before the false peace. Why the prolongation? It makes no sense on the surface. But like so much else in the sulphurous swamp of American foreign policy, a pattern can be detected if someone has the courage to explore beneath the surface.

We now know it was Kissinger himself who encouraged President Nixon to establish the White House

"Plumbers Squad" that burglarized the offices of Daniel Ellsberg, the man who leaked the "Pentagon Papers" to the press. A Jack Anderson column said the leak drove Kissinger to "near hysteria" and that he feared "disastrous consequences" from the Papers publication.

Why? Despite some alarmist cries to the contrary, there was nothing in the "Pentagon Papers" that would have benefited the Communists very much. Besides, Henry the K had already come to terms with our ostensible enemies. What Super K feared was danger from a far different source.

The Schlafly-Ward writing team suggests that the real reason for Kissinger's alarm was something else entirely.

What we did learn from the publication of the Pentagon Papers -- and obviously what Kissinger so feared we would learn -- was the existence of a powerful governmental conspiracy going back to the earliest Kennedy years, and the identity of the principal conspirators, of whom all the most influential were CFR members.

What Kissinger really feared was the exposure of the purpose of the conspiracy, and the continuity of the conspiratorial campaign to effect the clandestine unilateral strategic disarmament of the United States *by means of the prolongation of the Vietnam War*.

As the "Pentagon Papers" clearly reveal, *none* of the persons who was responsible for establishing U.S. policy in Vietnam had any intention of letting the generals win that bloody conflict. While the war was being prolonged, hundreds of billions of dollars were being wasted -- dollars that otherwise might have gone to weapons research and development.

But even more crucial, the devastating no-win conflict was used to divide Americans at home and to create a climate where "peace" on any terms -- even a total Communist takeover of Southeast Asia -- was acceptable.

Schlafly and Ward believe the Ellsberg group within what we are calling the Shadow Government became alarmed, through their own naive assessment of the situation, that the original Nitze-McNamara-Gilpatric escalation of the war was actually aimed at *defeating* the Communists. This was hardly the case: Every step-by-step buildup on "our" side was carefully matched so that the "other" side (indirectly armed and equipped by the United States), could respond. The idea clearly was not defeat but prolongation. Yet the Ellsberg group and the American Left operated under the assumption that U.S. policy in Vietnam had actually become anti-Communist -- an incredible misreading of reality.

Ellsberg, who had been a protege of Kissinger and was once recruited by Henry to help formulate a new foreign policy regarding Indochina, should have known better. (Or perhaps he did, and was simply being used to destroy, once and for all, any hope for an anti-Communist triumph.)

Incredibly enough, by November 1975 Henry the K all but claimed that his deliberate betrayal of our Asian allies represented a *victory* for us:

"One of the basic purposes of our original commitment in Indochina was to provide a buffer of security and time for the many nations of Southeast Asia to enable them to develop their own strength and cohesion. In this regard our efforts proved successful. . .

All of them are examples of self-reliance and national resilience."

It is doubtful that anyone, including Kissinger himself, believed that the Communist conquests of Laos, Cambodia and south Vietnam helped produce "self-reliance" or "national resilience". The message



from Washington could not have been clearer. Come to an accommodation with the Communist juggernaut or you will be ruthlessly and totally destroyed. Every other nation in the Far East saw the handwriting on the wall.

For the anti-Communists who did not escape or refused to change sides, retribution was swift. Paul Scott reported:

The killings by North Vietnamese and Viet Cong troops match any of the highly played-up massacres committed by Hitler during World War II. In one instance, more than 400 helpless orphans and at least five nuns in charge of the children were put to death by gunfire or beheaded. . .

Aerial photographs taken of the China Beach area in early April showed more than 30,000 bodies of South Vietnamese executed by the Communists. . .

Soviet-made trucks and tanks were used to run down fleeing South Vietnamese refugees and destroy churches and schools in which the refugees had taken haven.

According to Scott, at least one-quarter million vietnamese have been liquidated by the Communists since they seized control of South Vietnam. To put that figure in perspective, remember that the country is smaller than the state of Missouri.

According to *Time* magazine of April 19, 1976, a similar slaughter is even now taking place in Cambodia:

"Since the Communist victory last year, an estimated 500,000 to 600,000 people -- one-tenth of Cambodia's population -- have died from political reprisals, disease or starvation. . .

To escape the bloodbath, at least 25,000 Cambodians have fled across the border into Thailand. They tell tales of people being clubbed to death to save ammunition. Others have been bound together and buried alive by bulldozers, or suffocated by having plastic bags tied over their heads."

Henry K has said nothing about such reports, of course. Just as he has continuously disregarded that part of the Paris accord that required the Communists to account for some 2,300 Americans listed as Prisoners of War or Missing in Action.

The Communists refused all help and information regarding these POWs and MIAs. Instead they indicated the answers would not be forthcoming until the United States agreed to pay "reparations" totaling some \$3 billion.

The media in the United States have cooperated in the cover-up by ignoring both the fate of our missing soldiers and the slaughter of anti-Communist natives. And the memories of most Americans are short. If Walter Cronkite doesn't discuss it, it can't be important, can it?

Vietnam and Southeast Asia represent a complete rout for American foreign policy. The results have been the enslaving of additional millions, the collapse of any remaining anti-Communist resistance in Asia, an enormous gain in prestige for the Communists, and an incredible drop in prestige for the United States.

Like the shark in *Jaws*, Communism has been made to appear invincible, unstoppable, inevitable. But unlike that make-believe horror film, it is not because of its strength, but because of our weakness.

In June 1975, Kissinger was asked by *U.S. News and World Report*, "What effect has the Vietnam collapse had in the rest of the world?" He replied:

"I think the sudden collapse of Vietnam brought home to a lot of countries the central role of America and its foreign policy. It led to a profound concern in many countries about the conclusions we might draw from that event".

Or, to put it more succinctly, Who's next?

## Chapter Nine

EXCERPTS:

### THE RISING RED TIDE IN AFRICA

Gerald Ford was actively campaigning for re-election to the Presidency by March 1976. So it was not surprising that he had some tough things to say about the presence of 15,000 Cuban mercenaries in Angola, who were helping secure victory for the Soviet-backed faction in the rich African nation's civil war.

Secretary of State Henry Kissinger was also saying the right things -- or at least some of the right things. He, too, was "distressed" that Communist Cuba and the Soviet Union had intervened so blatantly in the newly independent nation. In none of his comments, though, did the Secretary even whisper a hope that a pro-Western faction might win. But at least Super K had finally begun to admit that *something* was going wrong in the strategic African country.

As the *Los Angeles Times* editorialized on December 17, 1975, until recently Herr Henry had pretended nothing at all was wrong:

In the five months since Kissinger has known of the Soviet buildup [in Angola], he has behaved toward Moscow as if nothing were happening, negotiating a new, long-term grain-sales agreement, forwarding a new strategic arms pact, planning another Soviet-American summit as if *detente* were in no way threatened.

In fact, when Kissinger met with African foreign ministers at the United Nations several months earlier, he could not even bring himself to use the words "Soviet Union" in condemning the blatant intervention of Communist countries in Africa. He intoned about "extracontinental powers" active on the continent. Tsk, tsk.

The *Times* could have added, but didn't that Henry K was also well aware of the fact that Cuban troops had been pouring into Angola for months. But rather than issue even a mild rebuke to Fidel Castro, Kissinger went charging right ahead with his plans to legitimize the Communist conquest of Cuba and even help his Comrades achieve their goal of a "de-Americanized" Panama Canal.

In the meantime, Henry's attitude about Angola appears to have pivoted a bit in recent years. According to the *Chicago Sun-Times*, Kissinger had concluded back in 1969 that the national interest did not "justify consideration of U.S. military intervention" in Angola or any other country in Southern Africa. But six years later the Secretary acknowledged that the Soviets were intervening on a massive scale, and he suggested that the U.S. should greatly expand its military assistance to the area.

But Henry the K was well aware -- he had to be -- that all anti-Communists had fled the area when "freedom" had been delivered on the point of a sword. Who would we help? The situation was so fouled up (or was it?) that the U.S. wound up being on the same side as Red China. Both supported the National Front for the Liberation of Angola (FNLA). The other allegedly pro-West faction, the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (described in one government report as "twelve guys with knives"), also received some U.S. support.

But it was the Marxist Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA) which got the enormous backing of the Soviet Union and Cuba. By 1976 the soviet Union was well on the way to establishing a client state in mineral-rich Angola. The Soviets thumbed their noses at *detente*, and Kissinger made sure that they got away with it.

While Congress refused to deliver any further U.S. aid to any of the factions in Angola, President Ford refused to put any pressure on the Soviets -- such as threatening to withhold American grain shipments -- to curtail Soviet activities in the area.

Henry explained that bartering with the U.S.-Soviet grain agreement would do "irreparable damage to *detente*, far in excess of anything the Angola issue might be worth".

So there we have the curious picture of our Secretary of State telling the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (on January 29, 1976) that

"the effort of the Soviet Union and Cuba to take unilateral advantage of a turbulent local situation where they have never had any historic interests is a willful, direct assault upon recent constructive trends in U.S.-Soviet relations and our efforts to improve relations with cuba".

But he refused to permit anything to be done which would have deterred the Soviets or their Caribbean captives from their aggression.

You could practically hear the laughter all the way from Red Square. Kremlin commentator Vikenty Matveev relayed the Politburo's views on Angola and *detente* when he declared, in December, 1975:

"The process of *detente* does not mean -- and will never mean -- a freezing of the social and political status quo in the world, or a halt to the anti-imperialist struggle. . . "

But why Angola? What are the stakes there?

The immediate goal is political. As the *Richmond News Leader* recently summarized:

"Strategically, Angola could be used as a base for attacks on South West Africa. A Communist-leaning Angola would be a threat to that ultimate South African domino, South Africa. Control of southern Africa would enable the Communists to cut the West's lifeline -- the sea lanes along which oil must travel to reach Europe and the Western Hemispheres."

In his brief tenure as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, tough-talking Daniel P. Moynihan warned of the military threat that a Soviet Angola would pose. In a sane world, such anti-Communist, pro-Western nations as south Africa and Rhodesia would be acknowledged as important allies of America.

But our kowtowing to "third world" mini-countries has meant watching from the sidelines as the United Nations branded Rhodesia "a threat to world peace" and demanded that the beleaguered country

be boycotted.

A previous ban on the importation of chrome ore from Rhodesia -- which made the U.S. totally dependent on the Soviet Union for this strategic mineral -- had been overturned in congress by the Byrd Amendment. but last October, President Ford and Secretary Kissinger pushed hard to repeal the amendment, which would re-impose the ban on Rhodesia chrome. Happily, the House of Representatives defeated the bill, but the debate graphically revealed where Ford and Kissinger stood.

Before the limp-wristed State Department policy makers pulled the rug out from under him, Ambassador Moynihan had warned that, should communists take over Angola, they would "considerably control the oil shipping lanes from the Persian gulf to New York". Not only that, he could have added, the Communists would have a lot more petrol of their own. For once again, there are oily overtones to the whole picture.

As of 1974, the former Portuguese territory was already the fourth-largest oil producer in Africa. Aside from its wealth in coffee, diamonds, iron ore, cotton, and grazing grounds, Angola -- which is twice the size of Texas and has a relatively sparse population of 6 million -- is known to possess untapped uranium and off-shore oil deposits. it is, in a word, *rich*.

Last year, a European political commentator named Pierre de Villemarest released this interesting report on events leading to the fall of Caetano government in Portugal (which led not only to the political turbulence in Portugal and the near-Sovietization of that country, but also made possible Portugal's surrendering of its overseas territories, including mineral-rich Angola):

In December 1971, David Rockefeller's Chase Manhattan Bank pressured Prime Minister Marcelo Caetano to accept its assistance. At the same time, negotiations were going on between Lisbon and Washington, for the use of the Portuguese Azores as a military post. According to Villemarest, chase Manhattan offered to help Lisbon in the negotiations and also pledged to bring in a flood of American investment dollars for the modernization and industrialization of Portugal.

The bank also offered to use its "good offices" to see that Portugal would be admitted into the Common Market. The price for all this help was high: Caetano was to promise "rapid democratization" and a decolonization program to give Portuguese Africa independence within two years.

Caetano knew what the chaotic results of that might be. He also knew that the Rockefellers were eyeing the oil resources of Cabinda and Angola. He refused. Within a few weeks he had been deposed, and scant months later an "independent" Angola was well along the road to being an official Soviet satellite.

But wait, there is more.

In February 1976, Gulf Oil Company reported that Henry Kissinger had given the company permission to pay the Soviet-backed regime in Angola about \$100 million in oil royalties that gulf previously had placed in escrow. Gulf holds the concession to operate the oil fields in Cabinda, and Angolan province separated from Angola proper by Zaire. The \$500 million annual royalty payment for the oil fields is the Angolan government's single largest source of income.

All of this, unfortunately, is only part of the ever-worsening picture.

As part of the Kissinger-maneuvered "Middle East peace" the Suez Canal is now open to the Soviet fleet -- but not the American Navy. this, of course, meant an enormous strategic gain fore the Soviets, since it gave them (but not us) greatly increased access to the Persian gulf and Indian Ocean.

And there is still more:

In June 1975, then-Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger startled Congress with photographic evidence that the Soviet Union was building a missile base at Berbera, Somalia, in northeast Africa. The port guards the entrance to the Red Sea and overlooks the oil routes between the Persian gulf and Europe.

The Communists scoffed at Schlesinger's warning, claiming that the photographs were actually of a large meat-packing plant. But in July members of the House and Senate Armed Services Committees visited somalia and confirmed that the "meat-packing plant" was indeed a soviet military base. Even *Newsweek* reported that

"the legislators saw a huge missile-storage building, complete with crates that apparently contained Soviet-made anti-ship Styx missiles, a clearing for a new airfield and a communications station manned by soviet personnel."

The Soviet build-up in Africa now includes military advisers in Guinea-Bissau, port and airfield rights in Guinea, advisers and arms in Equatorial Guinea, backup supplies in the Congo (Brazzaville), communications centers, airfield and naval facilities and the missile-storage sites in Somalia, and military aid to rebel forces in Nambia, a South African protectorate.

Ever since his appointment as National Security Adviser to the President, Henry Kissinger had maintained that the soviets placed "a low priority" on Africa -- particularly the central and southern portions of the continent. Apparently very few officials dared challenge his views; after all, why would the Communists be at all concerned about the massive oil reserves, the uranium fields, the gold mines, the strategic ports, or the other rich mineral potential, when things were going so well for them to the north?

So while our attention was focused on the Middle East, and the apparent Soviet setbacks in Egypt, the Communists have been preparing the groundwork for a Communist *coup* from the Sahara to south Africa. While all this goes on, it is super k's policy to treat any friends the U.S. has left in the area as enemies, while insisting that our avowed enemies be treated as friends.

Despite his occasional wrist-wringing, Herr Kissinger has made it clear that it is official United States policy to support black rule in Africa, no matter how violent or savage a regime's leaders might be. And when super K declares that the U.S. "will give no encouragement to illegal regimes" in Africa, he -- and his listeners -- know that he is talking about Rhodesia and South Africa.

During his good will visit to six African countries in May 1976, herr Henry was even more outspoken. The United States will use "unrelenting" pressure against Rhodesia, he pledged, until that stable, anti-Communist government has collapsed.

When Kissinger finished describing a ten-point anti-Rhodesia program the Ford Administration is adopting, Zambia's communist dictator Kenneth Kuanda was so overjoyed he publicly embraced the Secretary of Ste. Kissinger's program calls for, among other things, a U.s. boycott of Rhodesian chrome ore -- which would once more make us dependent on the Soviet Union for this strategic metal.

And as *detente* goes rolling right along, pity the poor official who gets in the way of it.

Daniel Moynihan spoke out forcefully at the United Nations about Soviet advances in Africa. His comments about the Communists' "new colonialism", and his unkind remarks about Africa's native leadership, "third world" shenanigans, and Communist duplicity were not in keeping with the spirit of *detente*. Friction with the State Department and even with Kissinger, his former mentor, was inevitable. Soon Moynihan had resigned.

For Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger, who can hardly be accused of harboring rightwing sentiments, the price of his dissent was to be summarily fired after differing with Administration policy over *detente*.

Even a close Kissinger friend, Establishment columnist Joseph Kraft, acknowledged on November 5, 1975, that

"Resentment of his [Kissinger's] power was so great that two of the best men in the Administration -- Assistant Secretary of Defense Robert Ellsworth and Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Charles Cooper -- have quietly resigned their jobs because they couldn't even get a hearing on issues where they differed with Kissinger".

No one in government -- *no one* -- challenges Kissinger's "Grand Design" and gets away with it. As a result, in Africa and elsewhere, the Red tide, like Ol' Man River, just keeps rolling along. Henry K is making sure that no one can stop it.

## Chapter Ten

### EXCERPTS:

Ehrlichman has been one of the most bitter victims of Watergate. Sentenced to twenty months to five years in a federal penitentiary for his part in the break-in of the office of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist, Ehrlichman said:

"It's tough when we go to jail for the Ellsberg break-in and the son-of-a-bitch who ordered it gets the Nobel Prize for Peace." The S.O.B. referred to was, of course, Henry Kissinger.

## WATERGATE AND THE CIA

The word "Watergate" was seared into the national conscience when, following President Nixon's carefully crafted landslide re-election in 1972, a series of innuendoes, rumors, and reports began to form an inescapable pattern. It seemed incredible, but apparently persons intimately connected with the President had been involved in planning a break-in at Democratic headquarters during the Nixon-McGovern campaign.

Then came the clincher: The truth was being smothered at the very top level of government, possibly by the President himself.

The nation was subjected to a propaganda circus and a national agony unlike anything it had known before in this century. Did a White House group engage in burglary? Had a President lied to the public? Before these questions were answered, incredible new disclosures made headlines.

The President's Oval Office was bugged, so that each and every conversation was on tape. The tapes had not been destroyed. And finally, they proved conclusively that President Nixon had deliberately staged a cover-up.

By the time the curtain was rung down, thirty persons linked to the President had been convicted. President Nixon was forced to resign, and he was spared possible conviction only by a special pardon issued by the unelected new President, Gerald Ford.

The intriguing chain of events seemed to start when an elected Vice President, Spiro Agnew, was forced out of office. an embattled President named a compromise stand-in choice -- Gerald Ford -- as Agnew's successor. Then, an inner circle of close presidential advisers was eliminated in one fell swoop. the only person to remain in place, unscathed, was the most powerful figure in the White House besides the President: Henry Kissinger.

Nixon's trusted lieutenants were replaced by men who were linked, one way or another, to the Rockefeller-Kissinger team.

Then, non-elected President Gerald Ford appointed the recently retired Governor of New York, Nelson Rockefeller, to be the nation's second non-elected Vice President. And suddenly Nelson rockefeller, the most visible member of the House of Rockefeller, a man who salivated after the presidency with the ardor of a hunting dog on point, was within range of a target he had been chasing for two decades. Hopelessly defeated in three previous presidential campaign, Rockefeller nevertheless was now the Vice President of the United States.

The House of Rockefeller had been the real power behind Richard Nixon for at least twelve years -- from the time in 1960 when Richard Nixon, with the Republican Presidential nomination already in the bag, flew to New York city to meet with Nelson Rockefeller.

Republicans everywhere understood the significance of the new Rockefeller-Nixon alliance. Nixon had traded his independence for approval by the House of Rockefeller.

In 1968, Nixon followed the Rockefeller game plan to the letter. For example, had he openly run on a platform promising to devalue the dollar, clamp wage-and-price controls on the economy, "open up" Red China, give away American wheat to the Soviets (in a deal which drove up prices at home), create countless new government agencies, promote the surrender of the Panama Canal, and greatly weaken our military posture, would he have been elected? Not hardly.

But, the ploy was to run this "conservative, businessman's" candidate against Liberal Hubert Horatio Humphrey in 1968, and then in 1972 against George McGovern, a man so far out in left field he was not really in the same ballpark. by engineering the nomination of McGovern at one of the country's more outrageous conventions, the Nixon (read it Rockefeller-CFR) propagandists were able to elect Nixon *on rhetoric*.

But as usual, while the conservatives were paid in lip service, the Liberals got the action. The dismantling of American sovereignty and the bankruptcy of the American economy continued at a dizzying pace under Nixon, while the CFR-Insiders made gigantic leaps toward their New World Order.

So what went wrong? If Nixon was a Rockefeller agent and had been doing his work so well for the boys in the backroom, why the need for his downfall? We may never know for certain. but with the benefit of new information and the 20-20 vision of hindsight, we can make some likely assumptions.

Rockefeller admittedly had wanted to be President since he first threw his baby rattle out of his crib. But, the office had eluded him for so long that the former young Republican reformer from New York was eligible to draw social security.

If Rocky were ever to realize his lifelong dream of sitting in the White House, had had to move fast. And yet he knew that he was not overwhelmingly popular with the grass roots of his own party. To become President, he needed to squeeze in through a crack in the back door.

We believe that Rocky expected Nixon to appoint him as Vice President when Agnew resigned.

Nixon, already under fire for Watergate, may have believed he could hang on to the Presidency by his fingernails by "stonewalling it". But, he probably feared (correctly) that if Nelson were the Vice President, the heat would be turned even higher so that Nixon would have to resign, thereby making the Standard Oil heir President of the United States without having to go through the electoral process. So Nixon double-crossed Rocky and appointed Ford, Nixon, however, could not hang on and Ford became President and Rocky the Vice President, Rocky was halfway home.

The first to fall in the Watergate scandals was the group of personal advisers Nixon brought with him to the White House. These were men loyal to Nixon, not the Eastern Liberal Establishment. And to the extent that this Palace Guard was *not* loyal to the Secret Government, it represented a potential danger.

These included, most particularly, H.R. Haldeman, White House Chief of Staff; John D. Ehrlichman, Assistant to the President; John Dean III, Counsel to the President; and, the men running the Committee to Re-Elect the President (perhaps appropriately referred to by its acronym, CREEP). When the smoke cleared, they were all gone.

Ehrlichman has been one of the most bitter victims of Watergate. Sentenced to twenty months to five years in a federal penitentiary for his part in the break-in of the office of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist, Ehrlichman said:

"It's tough when we go to jail for the Ellsberg break-in and the son-of-a-bitch who ordered it gets the Nobel Prize for Peace."

The S.O.B. referred to was, of course, Henry Kissinger. Had Ehrlichman known the full story it is doubtful if his comments would have been as restrained!

In his book *Before the Fall*, former Nixon staffer William Safire revealed that Kissinger, one of the strangest appointments to the Nixon team, was perhaps the very *first* member of the Palace Guard to use wiretaps on a routine basis.

It is now known that the K had virtually every one of his conversations recorded. Moreover, while National Security Adviser to Nixon he ordered taps placed on the phones of Richard F. Pederson and General Robert Pursley, who were, respectively, the closest aides of Secretary of State William Rogers and Defense Secretary Melvin Laird.

It goes without saying that neither man was remotely considered as a security risk. The taps were used, Safire reports, to give Kissinger a diplomatic advantage in the jockeying for power that was going on in the White House. Safire notes:

"Complaining to a correspondent about the perfidy of his archrival, Secretary of State Rogers, Henry then edited the transcript, changing words to reflect stronger support of the President by Kissinger, and then sent the revised version along to Haldeman -- an act of dishonor to the unsuspecting reporter and an act of disloyalty to the President",

And he adds:

"A man who could do this was capable of eavesdropping on his associates without scruple, and was capable of getting a special thrill out of working most closely with those he spied upon most."

So eavesdropping was nothing new to Henry Kissinger, the man who acquired total control over White House intelligence even before Watergate. But, as to Watergate itself -- who on earth planned it? And



why did they plan it?

What did the Nixon Republicans have to gain from the break-in? The coming Nixon-McGovern contest was clearly as predetermined as a professional wrestling match; it was not a question of whether Nixon would win, but simply by *how much* of a margin. there was absolutely no strategic reason to raid the Democratic headquarters.

Once the decision was made, however, you would think that the best men available would be used. You'd expect, in short, a *professional* job. but the burglary at the Democratic headquarters in the Watergate Hotel was not exactly carried out with the slick precision of a James Bond movie. It was about as smooth and professional as a Keystone Kops chase. It was so clumsy, in fact, that the whole operation smelled of a set-up.

First, one of the burglars alerted a guard, by replacing the tape over the door locks after the guard had discovered and removed the first one. Then, even though their efforts had been discovered, the bungling burglars incredibly were sent right back in. The man posted as lookout saw the police enter the building, but either failed to alert the men inside or his warning was ignored.

It was as though the burglars were supposed to be caught. And when they were, one of them conveniently was carrying the White House telephone number of E. Howard Hunt in his pocket.

The inspiration for Watergate, it was later revealed, grew out of a secret inner White House group known officially as the Special White House Investigating Unit; but called simply, "the Plumbers". The Plumbers were created by -- would you believe -- Henry Kissinger to stop leaks on his staff. both Nixon staffers John Dean and Charles Colson have reported that Kissinger got Nixon so upset over leaks that the President decided, at Kissinger's suggestion, to set up the investigating unit. John Dean goes even further, and charges that it was Nelson Rockefeller who had Kissinger sucker Nixon into forming the Plumbers. Little did Nixon know that he was being mousetrapped.

Nationally syndicated columnist Paul Scott reports:

Records of the Senate Watergate Committee investigation indicate that Dean's testimony concerning Rockefeller was never followed up by the committee's staff. The reason:  
Committee members were against calling Rockefeller.

Kissinger put a member of his staff, David Young, in charge of the unit. Young was a Wall Street lawyer who had worked for Rockefeller before being promoted to Kissinger's staff. After Watergate, Young was spirited off to a cushy assignment in London as a very advanced student, and the mediocracy has dutifully ignored his key role in Watergate.

So it was the activities of the Plumbers which brought the downfall of Richard Nixon. but no one has *ever* claimed that Richard Nixon initiated or even authorized the illegal activities of his so-called supporters. Why should he?

But, note that the man who *did* promote such illegal affairs -- the Rockefeller man who was growing more powerful every day -- emerged unscathed from the whole affair!

Remember that Kissinger now ran *all* intelligence operations, and even the Central Intelligence Agency was under his thumb. Is it any wonder that former White House aide Charles Colson has said that Nixon suspected the CIA was in the plot "up to their eyeballs".

Colson says Nixon wanted to fire the director of the CIA and personally investigate what was believed

to be a CIA conspiracy against him.

Nixon never got to investigate the Central Intelligence Agency. Oh yes, the revelations about Watergate ultimately brought a closer look at the activities of the CIA. but when a commission was finally brought together; seated at the chairman's spot was Nelson Rockefeller!!!

Despite its carefully crafted public image, the CIA is not now and for years has not been an anti-Communist agency.

Watergate burglar E. Howard Hunt, possibly one of the few authentic anti-Communists within the CIA, revealed in his book *Undercover* that he was one of the few pro-Goldwater conservatives in the Agency in 1964. But he admits he executed orders to work *against* Goldwater to prove his "professionalism".

Former CIA employee Patrick J. McGarvey in *C.I.A., The Myth and The Madness*, admits:  
"seldom, if ever, will you find a CIA agent who is a dedicated anti-Communist".

Philip Agee, who was a highly regarded (and highly paid) CIA agent for twelve years, now works openly for world "socialist revolution". In the early 1950s, it was CIA agents who broke into the offices of Senator Joseph McCarthy. this came at the time the famous anti-Communist claimed he had been given evidence of pro-Communist infiltration, corruption, and dishonesty within the CIA itself.

McGeorge Bundy, who certainly should be able to recognize a fellow egghead when he sees one, has said that there are more Liberal intellectuals in "the Company", as CIA employees call their organization, than in any other agency of government.

This preponderance of eggheads, no doubt, explains why intelligence from the CIA has been so consistently *wrong* concerning communist plans or personalities. It was the CIA, you'll remember, that first declared Fidel Castro was an anti-Communist; that said the East Germans would never try to build the Wall; that promoted Ahmed Ben Bella, Achmed Sukarno, Ho Chi-minh, Gamal Nasser, Patrice Lumumba, and literally scores of other Communist butchers.

With a record like this, an investigation is definitely called for. But putting Nelson Rockefeller in charge of the inquiry is akin to inviting Wiley Coyote to babysit for infant Roadrunners. (For the full story of Nelson Rockefeller's many years of service on behalf of the Communists, see this author's previous book, *The Rockefeller File*.)

Of the eight members of the commission, five were members of the Council on Foreign Relations, the Rockefeller-dominated Shadow government.

Is it any wonder that Henry Kissinger was able to blue-pencil key information from the Commission's report? (for details, see chapter Eleven.)

Is it any wonder that the *Boston Herald American* could report on October 31, 1973:

"Federal investigators have obtained Central Intelligence Agency documents that indicate former Director Richard Helms lied under oath about his role in White House attempts to mask the Watergate burglary as a CIA operations. . .

The new evidence. . . indicates that Helms was behind the CIA effort to limit the FBI probe."

Yes, the "fix" was put in at the top to protect the Central Intelligence Agency -- just as it was put in two years earlier to "get" Richard Nixon.

Nixon probably could have survived all of the rumors, speculations, and innuendoes about Watergate had it not been for one thing: those damned tapes. But in many ways, they are the most curious part of the whole story.

the fact that all of the President's conversations -- in fact, virtual all of his movements -- had been recorded was revealed almost casually at the Watergate hearings by Alexander Butterfield, white House liaison with the Secret Service. It is hard to believe that this bombshell, which was to remove a President, could be dropped with such an air of innocence. Could it have been planned?

We now know that Butterfield had been a CIA informant. He has been accused of working with (if not for) the CIA when he was in charge of all the tapings in the White House. Had Blabbermouth Butterfield, who was called to testify about other matters -- not the tapes -- "stonewalled" it, Nixon would not have been forced to resign.

Why didn't Nixon have the tape machines shut off the day after the Watergate arrests? Or, failing that, why didn't he destroy the tapes after Butterfield revealed their existence? Several rationalizations have been put forth, none of which rings true. One is that Nixon was mesmerized by the arrogance of power and did not believe the supreme Court could or would subpoena the tapes. Since there was no precedent, why take the risk? Nixon must have known his very survival as President of the United States was at stake.

Remember, releasing the tapes would not exonerate Nixon, they would prove him guilty of every cover-up charge made against him. Why would this cunning politician, this ruthless abuser of power, this man from whom no one would buy a used car, not simply destroy the tapes himself?

Can anybody believe that Nixon sat there like a good scout, watching the lynch mob fasten a hangman's knot out of those wretched tapes, and refused to destroy the noose? That isn't the Nixon depicted on the tapes -- much less in public life.

Why then did not Nixon, that ultimate political opportunist, burn the tapes? We believe the only logical answer is that *Nixon did not control the tapes*.

Have you ever wondered how everybody seemed to know what was on the tapes, and where, before they were "turned over" to committee staffs, special prosecutors, or Judge Sirica?

Consider the fantastic detail involved in the requests. Here is one sample:

January 8, 1973 from 4:05 to 5:34 P.M. (E.O.B.)

- a) at approximately 10 minutes and 15 seconds into the conversation, a segment lasting 6 minutes and 31 seconds.
- b) at approximately 67 minutes into the conversation, a segment lasting 11 minutes;
- c) at approximately 82 minutes and 15 seconds into the conversation, a segment lasting 5 minutes and 31 seconds.

As Dr. Susan Huck observed in the February 1976 issue of *American Opinion*:

"It does sound as though somebody -- obviously not the President -- has been curled up with those tapes for many a long hour, doesn't it? Somebody knows exactly where the juicy parts are, down to the second."

Remember, all white House conversations -- in person and on the phone -- had been "bugged" for at least a year. There were literally miles of tapes in storage somewhere. but it is obvious the investigators already had the evidence they sought when the various subpoenas were issued!

Who then controlled the tapes, or had access to a duplicate set? There is (understandably) very little information available on this crucial question. Remembering that the Nixon tape monitors were established by the Secret Service, it is of more than passing significance that *Newsweek* on September 23, 1974, reported:

While former white House chief of staff H.R. Haldeman awaits trial for his part in Watergate, the Secret Service chief he ousted from the White House last year has landed a plum job. robert H. Taylor, 49, who tangled with Haldeman over Nixon security procedures, is now head of the private security forces for all the far-flung Rockefeller family enterprises.

Hmmmm. Once Nixon is deposed, the head of the Secret Service -- the man in charge of the agency which was in charge of the tapes -- gets a "plum job" with the Rockefeller empire.

What of the Rockefeller's number one man in the White House? We know that Henry Kissinger was deeply involved in wiretapping his own staff and several journalists. But the one member of the White House staff who apparently never had his remarks taped in the Oval Office was Herr Kissinger -- who also, as it happens, was chief of all U.S. intelligence gathering operations. And who also, we no know, was responsible for establishing the Plumbers in the first place!

But through all of this, Kissinger's loyalty was not with the President, but with the Rockefellers! Kissinger had been through three losing campaigns with Nelson Rockefeller and openly spoke of despising Nixon.

Biographer David Hanna quotes Kissinger as stating, after Nixon's nomination in 1968:

"That man is unfit to be President. I would never work for that man. He is a disaster."

Watergate reporters Carl Bernstein and Bob Woodward have revealed that Henry the K was often openly contemptuous of Nixon, referring to him in front of other White House staffers as "our meatball President" and delighting in passing on the most despicable gossip and confidences about the President and First Lady. With a "friend" like Kissinger, you don't need any enemies!

Teaming up with Kissinger to administer the *coup de grace* to Nixon was another rockefeller man, General Alexander Haig. Haig is an intriguing case. Just as other associates connected with Kissinger jumped from virtual obscurity into key positions of influence (and as Kissinger himself had come out of nowhere into the second-most-powerful position in the Western world), Haig's meteoric career is as intimately linked to Henry the K as the latter's is to the Rockefellers.

Haig, a colonel when he joined Kissinger's staff in 1969, had been jumped to the rank of four-star general in four short years -- skipping the third star completely.

For a man with an absolutely undistinguished military record, this catapulting over 240 other general officers was most impressive indeed.

In the closing days of the Nixon Era, it was Haig who became more and more the acting President -- and it happens that it was Alexander Haig who controlled the vault where the Watergate tapes were kept. Blabbermouth Butterfield, who tipped off the Watergate Committee to the existence of the damning tapes, was a former colleague of Haig.

Lloyd shearer in *Parade* magazine noted how Haig "orchestrated the resignation march" by taking the evidence against the President to that dwindling number of GOP congressmen who were still loyal to Nixon. the final decision to resign came after two sets of talks -- first, with Nixon's formerly loyal Republican confidantes, and second, with Henry Kissinger and Alexander Haig.

Those final months and days of Watergate have been variously described. Kissinger himself has said that Nixon "barely governed" during his last months in office, that he had been an "odd and artificial man".

Charles Colson has said that Nixon was a virtual "captive" of Haig and Kissinger during the final months in the Oval Office.

Curious, isn't it, that the three big Watergate winners turned out to be Gerald Ford, Nelson Rockefeller, and Henry Kissinger? And is there *anyone* in America who truly believes that it is the President who tells the Vice President and Secretary of State what to do or say? As columnist Paul Scott has said, Ford can no more fire Henry Kissinger than he can tell his wife Betty to shut up!

the man who got the whole thing started, of course -- who tapped the first telephone and toppled the first domino -- was Henry Kissinger, proving once again that no man can serve two masters. Just as Haig had said that he "was never a Nixon man", Kissinger had boasted of Nixon, "I would never work for that man". He didn't. He was an agent for someone else.

## Chapter Eleven

### MOSCOW'S MAN IN WASHINGTON?

On August 14, 1975, during a press conference at the Hyatt House in Birmingham, Alabama, Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger was asked a most embarrassing question. The reporter asked:

"Mr. Secretary, we received a report that a Colonel General Michael Goleniewski, who was a Polish Army intelligence officer in World War II, had identified a list of KGB and GRU agents and officers who have since been arrested, tried and convicted.

The General. . . also identified you, Mr. Kissinger, as having worked for a Soviet intelligence network -- code name ODRA -- headquartered in Germany *during* World War II, at the same time you were a U.S. Army counter-interrogator and instructor in a military intelligence school. . .

Is this true? And, if not, how do you explain your name being on General Goleniewski's list?"

With characteristic aplomb, a seemingly unruffled Secretary of State replied: "I don't know who Colonel Goleniewski is, but I think he should be given the Pulitzer Prize for fiction".

But thereby hangs a tale -- in fact, several of them.

To begin with, as the nation's top security man -- the funnel and sieve for *all* intelligence data to and from Washington -- Henry Kissinger surely *did* know who Colonel Goleniewski is.

First, as we shall see, Goleniewski was one of the most important defectors from the Communist intelligence apparatus ever to reach our shores. His "debriefing" by the State Department and the CIA had taken years; in that time, Goleniewski had identified hundreds of double-agents and his record for accuracy was unmatched.

Moreover, rumors about Kissinger's recruitment by the KGB had been heard for years, and were the subject of hundreds, if not thousands, of inquiries to the State Department and the White House. It is hardly possible that Henry K -- a man who collected gossip the way J. Paul Getty collected paintings -- had not heard about them.

The story actually began in the early 1950s, when a Colonel in Polish intelligence started supplying data on Soviet operations and agents to the Americans. The man identified himself as Michael Goleniewski and said he was a staunch anti-Communist.

During the next decade, Goleniewski furnished U.S. agents with over 5,000 pages of top-secret documents, 160 microfilms of secret reports, 800 pages of Soviet intelligence reports, the names of hundreds of Communist agents in Western Europe, and much more.

Then in 1961, fearing that his pro-U.S. activities had been discovered by the KGB, Goleniewski defected to the United States. He arrived in this country on January 12, 1961, accompanied on a Military Air Transport plane by CIA agent Homer E. Roman.

State Department Security Officer John Norpel Jr. testified before the Senate Internal Security subcommittee that, of the copious information Goleniewski had supplied to the Americans during a *three-year* debriefing, *none* was found to be untrue or inaccurate.

It is known that the Goleniewski revelations led, among many other things, to the exposure of the major sex-and-spy scandal in the U.S. Embassy in Warsaw, the identification of Soviet agent Colonel Kolon Molody and four members of his cell in England, the exposure of the Swedish colonel Stig Eric Wennerstrom as a double agent and General in the Soviet KGB.

Goleniewski revealed that British Intelligence official George Blake was a Soviet spy, he identified scores of other KGB-GRU operatives in West Germany, Denmark, and France. So valuable were his revelations that the 88th Congress passed House Resolution 5507 to honor Goleniewski's contributions to American security and our intelligence efforts.

The Resolution said in part that Goleniewski "has collaborated with the government in an outstanding manner and under circumstances which have involved grave personal risk. He continues to make major contributions to the national security of the United States. His primary motivation in offering to work with the government has been and remains his desire to counter the menace of Soviet Communism".

In other words, the man's credentials are absolutely impeccable. He *was* a top-ranking communist intelligence agent; he *has* exposed literally hundreds of communist agents in the West -- men who are deliberate traitors to the countries they pretend to serve.

And what is the point of this story? Precisely this: One of the men identified by Goleniewski in the early 1960s as a soviet agent was an unknown professor at Harvard named Henry A. Kissinger. Here is

the incredible account, as related by *American Opinion* contributing editor Alan Stang in the march 1976 issue of that magazine:

In the days following World War II, the Soviets had organized an ODRA spy ring in Poland. Its main purpose was to penetrate British and American military intelligence. ODRA was directed by a Soviet general named Zelanznikoff; its local chief was a Colonel Kujun.

In 1954, Kujun was ordered to Moscow to explain the mysterious murder of a female Soviet courier and the disappearance of important material, including 480,000 in intelligence funds. Fearing he would be shot, Kujun tried to commit suicide but instead wound up in a hospital run by the GZI, the Polish equivalent of the Russian KGB.

The GZI chief, a Colonel Wozniesiensi, interrogated Kujun at length. He stored the results of his investigation in his safe. Wozniesiensi was later replaced by a Colonel Skulbaszewski, who himself was replaced in 1956 by Goleniewski. the "Polish" agent told Stang he inherited Skulbaszewski's office, files, and safe -- the latter containing some 1500 pages of documents.

About twenty pages of these documents were in Russian, in Wozniesiensi's handwriting. They dealt with the interrogation of Colonel Kujun in 1954 and included a list of the true names, as well as the code names, of ODRA's principal agents in Europe

One such spy was Ernst Bosenhard, who had been employed as a clerk at the U.S. Intelligence Headquarters in Oberammergau, Germany. Bosenhard had sent untold numbers of top-secret documents on to Moscow before he was arrested and convicted of espionage in 1951.

Another name on Wozniesiensi's OKRA list was the agent "Bor", who had worked with Bosenhard in Oberammergau. A 1954 update indicated that "Bor" had returned to the United States, was presently at Harvard University, and was secretly working with the Central Intelligence Agency.

According to the list, "Bor's" real name was Sgt. Henry A. Kissinger. Stang then reports the following conversation he had with Goleniewski:

"Were you actually present when the KGB opened Colonel Skulbaszewski's safe?"

"Well, I opened Colonel Skulbaszewski's safe."

"You opened it yourself?"

"Right."

"And in Colonel Skulbaszewski's safe there was a list of Soviet agents -- and on that list was the name: Henry Kissinger."

"Right."

Goleniewski also told Stang:

"At this time I learned about Sergeant Kissinger, Sergeant Kissinger was for me a quite

nobody. I didn't know who he was. I didn't know was he a Jew, or was he German, or what hell he was. What I knew, that he got to be for one reason or another involved in counter-intelligence Smersh network of Soviets under code name "Bor", and it happened sometimes in Germany after he came with American Army. And in '61 for me it was one of hundred cases. I didn't pay no attention. Such cases they really existed hundreds, you see."

If there is even the most remote possibility that these charges are true, how could Kissinger have received any government post, much less rise to the exalted position he holds today? First, remember that by 1968, Goleniewski's revelations had been buried deep in the bowels of the government's security agencies.

Moreover, Nixon was so anxious to get Kissinger on the job that the President waived the normal security check on Henry. By the time the issue was raised, Kissinger was King of the Hill so far as security was concerned; he told the investigators whom to investigate.

Yes, it *can* happen. . . and has. thirty years ago Alger Hiss proved that a Soviet spy could sit at the right hand of a President. Just two years ago, West German chancellor Willi Brandt was forced to resign when it was revealed that one of his top aides, Gunter Guillaume, was a Communist spy. Gullaume had fooled West German security -- which is *very* conscious of communist infiltration techniques -- for years.

There have been efforts to dismiss Goleniewski's charges as "mis-information" carefully planted by the KGB. One author, Richard Deacon, even suggests in *The Chinese Secret Service* that the KGB was willing to sacrifice such key agents as Wennerstrom, Blake, Molody and Krogers to enhance the false defector's credibility.

Such a charge assumes that the Soviets regard Henry the K as a dangerous anti-Communist adversary. But as we have seen, precisely the opposite is true! Henry is, at the very least, one of their most trusted friends and colleagues.

Moreover, Goleniewski's charges date back at least twelve years -- long before Henry the K had achieved any national position or prestige. It is the fact that Goleniewski named Kissinger as a Soviet agent so long ago, when there was no Kissinger axe to grind, which leads us to believe the charge is true. that, and the Kissinger record during the past eight years.

But intriguingly, except for a few accounts in small intelligence journals, the major media have refused to touch the Goleniewski allegations with a ten-foot pole. Perhaps his believability was tarnished when a New York newspaper identified the "Polish" defector as the son of Czar Nicholas II of Russia.

On June 11, 1971, the *New York Daily Mirror* announced the exclusive publication of *Reminiscences and Observations* by "His Imperial Highness Aleksei Nicholaevich Romanoff, Tsarevich and Grand Duke of Russia", son of Nicholas II and survivor of the alleged Communist massacre of the Russian royal family.

H.I.H. Aleksei romanoff and Michael goleniewski were one and the same man! According to the *Daily Mirror*, former CIA Chief of Research and Analysis Herman E. Kimsey, in an affidavit signed June 3, 1965, had verified the man's identity on the basis of fingerprints sole prints, dental and medical records, handwriting tests, blood tests, and recognition and confrontation with childhood friends and relatives.

Recent documents released by the British government lend credence to Goleniewski's claims. The Royal family of Russia apparently was not murdered by the Bolsheviks as had been widely believed. The Czar and his family were spirited out of Russia by British agents, but were afraid to make the fact that they were still alive known. Doubtless they hoped that the Bolshevik government would collapse and



they could return to Russia. Little did they know that the West would send critical transfusions of food, money, and technology to keep the bloody Bolsheviks in power.

Perhaps we can get a better perspective by noting that the chief prosecution witness, Michael Goleniewski, has already testified under oath and has said he would be delighted to repeat his charges in a trial of Henry Kissinger. While the defendant in this instance, Henry Kissinger, dismisses the whole matter with a joke. . . and a lie.

At the very least, congress should investigate these charges -- perhaps as part of a larger study of the Kissinger record. When such a hearing is called, we hope the Congressmen will also look into the other quacking creatures in the Kissinger barnyard.

This would include, for example, Wilfred Burchett, the Australian communist who was deprived of a passport by his own government because of his aid to the communists in the Korean War. burchett was welcomed to Washington by Kissinger in 1971 for "consultations" on the Vietnam War. the man who helped secure phony "germ warfare" confessions from Allied prisoners during the Korean War was one of Hanoi's most trusted emissaries.

How jolly. Just what was said we'll never know. But for Kissinger to base any part of the negotiations on statements by Burchett is the equivalent of consulting Al Capone on how to clean up crime in Chicago!

a much more important Kissinger contact is the mysterious Victor Louis, one of Moscow's most trusted -- and most important -- KGB agents. Kissinger is reported to have met secretly with Louis in the Soviet Embassy in London just after his first trip to Red China. "Victor Louis" is, in reality, Vitaly Yuvgenyevich Lui, who operates under the cover of being the Moscow correspondent for the *London Evening News*.

Even a casual scrutiny of Kissinger's colleagues and collaborators at the State Department reveals an amazing similarity in the way the flock looks, walks, and quacks. Among the many things they all have in common is an unswerving devotion to detente, downgrading U.S. defenses, undercutting our national security, courting the Soviets, and aiding the communist world.

One of the key Kissinger appointees, for example, is Helmut Sonnenfeldt, a long-time State Department official who is now in charge of trade with the Communists.

A chum dating back to Kissinger's soldiering days in Germany, Sonnenfeldt is known to have been the subject of espionage investigations. According to intelligence expert Frank Capell, three former U.S. Foreign Service officers have testified under oath that in the 1950s Sonnenfeldt turned over secret information to "agents of a foreign power". Capell says that Sonnenfeldt also compromised U.S. codes, and that security officers recommended his prosecution.

Sonnenfeldt's nomination for a high Treasury Department post had to be withdrawn several years ago when it became known that witnesses were seeking to testify that Sonnenfeldt had committed perjury during the confirmation hearing on his nominations.

But even though Sonnenfeldt has been labeled a security risk, Henry the K got his buddy "cleared" through the Office of Security. How? by putting Jesse MacKnight in charge of the clearing. MacKnight was sure to be sympathetic -- he had been identified in the past as an operative for Soviet intelligence and had provided Soviet spy Judith Caplan with government reports. CFR member Sonnenfeldt was sure to feel safe with MacKnight in charge of catching subversives.

sonnenfeldt is the only member of Kissinger's coterie who attends those closed-door conferences with

Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin. Of course Sonnenfeldt worked closely with Kissinger in Moscow on the SALT I agreements. It is Sonnenfeldt who said that no efforts should be made by us -- or permitted by others -- to free the Captive Nations, and characterized a yearning to be free by Poles as "romantic political inclinations."

MacKnight and Sonnenfeldt were hardly the only security risks helping forge the Kissinger Team. Not by a long shot. Kissinger arranged for William O. Hall, known to security officers as an associate and contact of known Communists and soviet agents, to be named as Director General of the U.S. Foreign Service, although he had been identified as a serious security risk as far back as 1956.

Hall was safe as houses until The Review of the News exposed his background in 1972. Hall then decided to retire, and Kissinger selected James S. Sutterlin to replace him. Sutterlin had been "intimately linked" with Edward Kelley, security officer at the U.S. Embassy in Warsaw during the sex-and-spy scandals involving soviet agents and other diplomatic personnel.

While serious security risks received promotion after promotion in Henry Kissinger's State Department, known anti-Communists were being purged.

One of the men "selected out", as the euphemism goes, was career officer John D. Hemenway. Hemenway was a victim of an obvious conspiracy which used false reports and dishonest job ratings to get him removed. Unlike many others who just went quietly, however, Hemenway appealed. The hearings completely exonerated Hemenway, who was recommended for reinstatement, a promotion, and apology, and even reimbursement for legal expenses. But Kissinger's good friend director General William Hall reversed the board's decision. And the purge went on.

Another SALT man and top-ranking intelligence officer on the Kissinger team is Boris Klosson. It was Klosson who, as U.S. counselor for political affairs in Moscow in 1961, cleared the way for Lee Harvey Oswald's return to the United States. It is known that Oswald, the so-called "lone assassin" of John Kennedy, had attended a KGB school for nearly two years.

Given the Soviets' track record of introducing agents into foreign countries, it is hard to imagine that Oswald's claim of a change of heart could convince such a career officer. (And if Oswald really had a sincere change of heart, does it make sense that the Russians would have allowed him to leave the country?)

It's less puzzling, perhaps, when we note that in a recent State Department appeal case, a Foreign Service officer told how Klosson thwarted him from sending a report back to Washington dealing with KGB operations against Americans in Russia.

And then there is the incredible case of Kissinger's selection as U.S. ambassador to Chile. Kissinger tapped ultra-Leftist David Popper to represent us in a country which had just overthrown the first elected Communist government in Latin America.

Popper, who had been affiliated with the subversive Institute of Pacific Relations, had been recruited into the State Department by Alger Hiss. He also served on the editorial board of *Amerasia*, the magazine which was later revealed to be the center of a Soviet espionage ring.

Our Secretary of State's selection for U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of China -- that is, Free China -- was even more outrageous. It was none other than Leonard Unger, our former ambassador to Thailand, the man on the scene during the strangely contrived overthrow of the anti-Communist government of Prime Minister Thanom Kittikachorn.

More than two decades ago, a former Soviet agent named Elizabeth Bentley shocked a congressional Committee when she testified that the Soviets were operating four spy rings within the U.S. government. Only two of the rings were ever exposed. According to one security agency, one of the two rings not exposed operated in the European Affairs section of the State Department; the confidential report identified six persons, including Leonard Unger, as members.

At least one of Kissinger's close contacts admits to being a communist. That is the man the FBI once identified as the top KGB operative of them all -- Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin, the head of all KGB operations in the United States.

It is now known that the Rockefeller commission investigating CIA activities (which is akin to Jesse James investigating the Daltons) heard testimony which revealed an intricate KGB espionage network on Capitol Hill. The Soviets even had the capability of intercepting White House and Congressional telephone calls! What did Kissinger do about this misbehavior by his friends? He ran interference for them!

*Newsweek* magazine reported on August 25, 1975:

"Henry Kissinger's anxiety to avoid strains on U.S.-Soviet relations extended to editing the Rockefeller commission's study of intelligence activities. The original draft of the . . . report contained a lengthy section on Soviet espionage in the U.S., including the KGB's ability to intercept White House communications via special antennas on the Russian Embassy roof. This passage was excised from the Rockefeller report when it was reviewed by the National Security Council, which Kissinger heads."

By mid-1975, both the Rockefeller Commission and a committee chaired by Senator Frank Church were investigating both the CIA and FBI. But anyone who believes the committees were concerned with Communist activity in this country would be sadly mistaken.

Clearly, the committees were out to get the *anti*-Communists. What remained of American internal security was swiftly going down the drain as Super K achieved power over the nation's intelligence community. The record is clear: The Justice Department's Internal Security division was abolished in March 1973; the Subversive Activities Control Board was dismantled three months later; in 1974 the Attorney General's List of Subversive Organizations was eliminated; January 1975 the House Internal Security Committee was abolished.

So this is what the picture looks like, in this Bicentennial Year celebrating 200 years of freedom: As the Communist military menace expands because of Kissinger's secret diplomacy at the Strategic Arms Limitations Talks, the United States has slipped -- or been pushed -- into number two position. And as communist infiltration and penetration of this country increased, the ability of U.S. security forces to maintain surveillance on such infiltration decreased.

Security -- at least Western security -- doesn't seem to bother Henry K one little bit.

But with the Kissinger Team in charge -- men like Hall, Sonnenfeldt, Klosson, Popper, Bunker, and all the others -- captained by an arrogant egoist who is a *proven* liar and an accused KGB agent, do we really need to worry about any *foreign enemies*?

It is not difficult to agree with William Loeb, maverick publisher of the *Manchester* (New Hampshire) *Union-Leader*, who wrote:

"Perhaps Kissinger really is a communist agent. Certainly, he could not do any more harm to the United States or any more good for the Soviet Union if he were!"

## Epilogue:

EXCERPTS: (remember, this was written in 1976)

What can one say about the Middle East? It is a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma. It is a pail of snakes and a bucket of worms. God knows how it will all end. But, one this is certain: The Middle East is a time bomb ticking away, and the United States is arming both Israel and the Arabs with the world's most sophisticated weapons.

Henry Kissinger's Middle East peace plan calls for 200 Americans to staff three electronic warning stations located in the Sinai desert between the Arabs and Israelis. Could there be a better way to get us involved in a Mideast War? What happens if one side or the other attacks and kills those Americans? Or what if one side wipes out a town or a garrison on the other side -- and the U.S. is blamed for not alerting the victims? Does it all sound too much like the Tonkin Gulf incident, which was used to ram through a House Resolution authorizing our involvement in Vietnam?

-----

At least this is what Henry Kissinger and his masters in the Shadow Government hope has happened. **If America has lost the will to resist, then our collapse -- and the triumph of Kissinger's New World Order -- are inevitable.**

## THE IMPACT OF KISSINGER

The deteriorating world situation is one most people would rather not think about. Surely, somehow we will muddle through. doesn't God watch over drunks, small children, and the United States of America? Our citizens have fretted about Communism for so long we are tired of fretting. the tragic Vietnam war drained our emotional reserves. Now most of us don't want to think about international affairs. Maybe *detente* will work. Maybe the Communists have lost their zeal and will settle for live-and-let-live coexistence with America. And maybe cows can fly.

Sure, we can dream. But dreaming is very dangerous while driving. We had better wake up before the national automobile goes careening off the road.

Let's look at what has happened during the eight years Kissinger has held the reins of power in Washington. We know that this protege of the Rockefeller family was carefully trained and coached by his oily benefactors for his position in the Nixon Administration.

Remember that Nelson sent Henry off to Washington with a \$50,000 "gift" in his wallet. Even if we dismiss the possibilities that Kissinger has been a double-agent, serving the Soviets since the end of World War II (and this is certainly a charge which merits thorough investigation), it is undeniable that Kissinger is a paid agent of the House of Rockefeller, and has been since his days at Harvard.

Moreover, it is beyond dispute that the chief goal of the Rockefeller family is the creation of what they call a New World Order. This phrase is used over and over again by the Rockefellers and their agents and allies in the Shadow Government, including Henry A. Kissinger. Herr Henry can barely finish a paragraph, much less a whole speech, without using this key phrase two or three times.

The Rockefellers do not even bother denying that World Government is their goal. Nelson

acknowledged as much in a book called *The Future of Federalism*, in which he boldly stated that national independence is outmoded and must be replaced by an international super-government. the book, first published in 1963, has been reissued since Rocky became Vice President. The Rockefellers do not need to keep their plans secret; they know that the mass media won't blow the whistle on them. When you own the referees, you don't need to worry about the American public upsetting the game plan for a New World Order!

During his nearly eight years at the helm of American foreign policy, Kissinger has diligently pursued the Rockefeller plan for a Great Merger into a New World Order.

The master planners running the show know that American are not going to surrender their sovereignty -- unless they feel there is simply no other alternative. In order to create the psychological atmosphere within America for acceptance of the New World Order, the Shadow Government has had to build the Soviet Union into a credible threat.

Achieving this has taken bluff and bluster, and literally billions of dollars in aid and trade. but it has finally been accomplished. When Kissinger told Admiral Zumwalt that America is comparable to Athens, while the Soviet Union is Sparta, he was describing the position that he has labored to create! Once the machines of mass misinformation in the media convince enough Americans that this is indeed the case, the next step will be the argument that the best deal we as Athens can get is to merge in a world government with Sparta. And the trusting, gullible American public will reluctantly conclude that this must be true.

Kissinger has consistently promoted programs to build up the Soviet Union, by transferring critical technology to Russia and by making billions of dollars in loans and credits available to the Soviets. Once he had taken control of foreign policy, Henry the K could then hit freedom with a double-whammy. At the same time he was turning on the electricity to activate the communist Frankenstein, he was turning off the current to the monster's victims. Or, to switch analogies in midstream, Henry has provided guns to the neighborhood hoodlums and then told the local merchants not to bother him with their new problems.

Most Americans still do not realize what Kissinger and his masters are arranging for them, or what they have already arranged for others. but when Vietnam was personally giftwrapped for the communists by our Nobel Peace Prize-winning Secretary of State, the non-Communists in Asia saw the Red handwriting on the wall. The fact that Henry was actually in Peking on the very day that the Nationalist chinese -- the staunchest anti-Communists in Asia, and our one-time allies -- were kicked out of the United Nations, made the signals unmistakably clear. Japan, the Philippines, and other Asian nations, realizing the implications of their corner of the world being dominated by Maoland, began clamoring for the best deal they could get with the Communists.

Free China is abandoned and stranded; the courageous people there are being left to turn slowly, slowly in the wind. with socialist India already a quasi-Soviet satellite, and the Suez Canal open to the Soviet fleet, the Indian Ocean is being turned into a Red lake. No opposition to communist imperialism can be expected from that part of the world.

The ship of western civilization has been deliberately torpedoed in Africa, and is sinking now. secretary of State Kissinger helped fire the crucial shot when he encouraged the fall of Portugal from the ranks of anti-Communist nations, thereby leaving the Portuguese territories in Africa ripe for plucking. Angola and Mozambique were swallowed almost at once. It is probable that Rhodesia will be the next to fall. And then beleaguered south Africa will be the only outpost against communism on the continent, left without friends, without aid, and without hope; how long will it remain free?

The picture in europe is hardly brighter. England is destitute and decadent, the victim of decades of

socialism foisted upon it by limousine liberals and rule-or-ruin union leaders.

In France, the Communists now have the country's second-largest political party and through a coalition with other socialist parties, could come to power at any time.

The same situation prevails in Italy. Thanks to our inept policies, the U.S. Navy is no longer welcome in Greece. As a result of the Soviet buildup and defaulting by U.S. policy-makers, the Mediterranean is now thoroughly dominated by the Russian Navy.

What can one say about the Middle East? It is a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma. It is a pail of snakes and a bucket of worms. God knows how it will all end. But, one thing is certain: The Middle East is a time bomb ticking away, and the United States is arming both Israel and the Arabs with the world's most sophisticated weapons.

Henry Kissinger's Middle East peace plan calls for 200 Americans to staff three electronic warning stations located in the Sinai desert between the Arabs and Israelis. Could there be a better way to get us involved in a Mideast War? What happens if one side or the other attacks and kills those Americans? Or what if one side wipes out a town or a garrison on the other side -- and the U.S. is blamed for not alerting the victims? Does it all sound too much like the Tonkin Gulf incident, which was used to ram through a House Resolution authorizing our involvement in Vietnam?

There is one continent where the communists suffered defeats during the past eight years: South America. In both Brazil and Chile, openly Marxist rulers were tossed out and replaced by anti-Communists. You would think that America's leaders would be thankful; instead, Henry the K has criticized the new governments far more harshly than he did their Communist predecessors.

And other countries, looking to see what the might colossus to the north will do next, are aware that Kissinger intends to legitimize the Castro regime and surrender control of our Panama Canal to Panamanian dictator Torrijos, a Communist puppet. Letting the Canal fall under anti-American domination will be the signal to other South American countries that they too had better scramble to get the best deal they can in the New World Order.

Take a look at the globe and you can see the kettle of fish Henry has prepared for us. The natural resources of the world and the sea lanes to transport them increasingly are controlled by the Communists. The implications of the Suez Canal, the Panama Canal, the Cape of Good Hope, the Indian Ocean, and the Mediterranean Sea being closed to U.S. shipping are enormous. And, the Soviets are going for the jugular. When Argentina decides that Athens is capitulating to Sparta and elects to take sides with the apparent winner, the noose would be cinched.

Operating behind the cloak of detente the Soviets are expanding their spheres of interest and are devoting more and more of their resources to converting the technology *we* supply them into military goods and weapons. At the same time, more and more of our military budget is being spent on salaries and fancy padding, not weapons research and development.

The military has purchased from their new *partners*, weapons to contain the populations of the countries, in order to "maintain internal peace", as stated in the Arms Control and Disarmament Act. "Non-lethal" weapons, they are called, to put down civil uprisings; conduct "urban warfare" should the unlikely situation arise that citizens today would actually rise up and say "NO"; crowd control, and the technology to watch, track and listen to our every move. It isn't too late. It just looks that way. With Creator/God All things are possible. - Jackie}

In retrospect, it may turn out that the Vietnam War was the worst disaster ever to befall the United

States. The war could have been won -- or lost -- very quickly. Even if we had decided to toss in the towel in Vietnam, as the French did before us, the United States still could have survived. But, to fight a war for twelve years -- pulling our punches all of the time -- and then to walk away, letting the Communists overrun the country, is unquestionably the worst of all possible worlds.

Look what the "no-win" Vietnam war did to America. First, it badly dislocated our economy, triggering a wave of inflation with far-reaching consequences that are still hurting us. More important, the Vietnam War gave birth to and nurtured the "new morality" and the hippy subculture. It led millions of young persons to hate and despise their country. In the long run, the dug-and-dropout culture spawned by the Vietnam War may prove more damaging to the United States than an atom bomb attack.

Moreover, the war discredited, discouraged, and demoralized our military in a way that no defeat on the battlefield ever could. The ultimate casualty, however, may have been America's conscience and spirit. Our will to resist Communism may have been buried beneath the frustration of the Vietnam war, while our dedication to the cause of freedom is mesmerized by Kissinger's siren song of detente.

At least this is what Henry Kissinger and his masters in the Shadow Government hope has happened. If America has lost the will to resist, then our collapse -- and the triumph of Kissinger's New World Order -- are inevitable.

To hasten the day when "Athens" is so weak and "Sparta" so strong that resistance is impossible, Henry the K has given the Communists the green light everywhere in the world. And their progress during the past eight years is nothing short of phenomenal. Yet thanks to the cloak of silence that is maintained around Communist advances by the mass media, their gains have passed virtually unnoticed by the majority of Americans.

It is not enough that Henry Kissinger be retired as Secretary of State, and allowed to retreat to some Ivy League citadel of illogic. Daily he becomes more controversial. . . but for all of the wrong reasons. Yes, he is arrogant. He is deceptive. He is an egomaniac. He is all the things that his political critics say he is. He will probably be gone by January 1977, as the Shadow Government offers up his departure to quiet the populace. But the Insiders will move heaven and earth to perpetuate his policies.

Getting rid of Kissinger is important, yes. But if he is replaced by just another Rockefeller front man, the gesture will be meaningless. In order to survive, America must repudiate Kissinger's policies and restore its determination to remain free and independent. This means shutting off the transfer of money and technology to our avowed enemies, re-establishing our defensive capabilities, and encouraging other nations in the non-Communist world to defend themselves.

Under the present game plan there is no reason for the Communists {Zionists! - JP} to abandon their goals. why should they, when they are winning?

But Communism, for all its successes (mostly sponsored by "our" government), is very fragile. Its economy is not self-sufficient and its satellites are not loyal. If we stopped rescuing Communism from its failures and propping up its slave system, the Soviet Union would have to practice genuine peaceful coexistence. It would have to stop its efforts to conquer others, and turn inward to solve its own problems or face some nasty revolts.

The road to true peace with freedom does not lie in disarmament and detente, but in strength and resolve.

The United States stayed on that road during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth centuries, and our policies made us the hope and envy of the world. It is not too late to switch paths; it is not too late to tell

Henry Kissinger and his masters and mentors in the Shadow Government that we want no part of their New World Order.

But we must start now. And the order to change directions must come from *you*.